



AMERICAN
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. V.—AUGUST, 1891.—NO. 2.

THE ENCYCLICAL "RERUM NOVARUM."

I.

THE ENCYCLICAL AND SOCIALISM.

Importance of the Encyclical.

SELDOM has a document emanating from one of the rulers of the world, or even from the highest moral authority on earth, created so deep a sensation as that which is caused by the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. The powerful Hohenzollern, the devout Hapsburg, and the President of the French Republic, whom none will suspect of clerical bias, have thanked the Pope for his eloquent assertion of the claims of poverty, of the duties of wealth, and of the rights of eternal justice. In these acknowledgments of the benefits conferred upon mankind, are we to see nothing more than the courteous expressions of personal regard? No! the men who have read carefully the signs of the times give far more significance to these official tokens of respect. The whole social order is threatened; and the rulers of men feel that they cannot cope with the impending difficulties. It is true that they wield powerful weapons; but these weapons may fall at any moment into the hands

of the mob. Physical force is inadequate, moral force indispensable; and Rome is the moral centre of the world. Rome has spoken; and the cause of order is strengthened by a moral force which pervades all the parts of Christendom.

“The momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it,—and there is nothing which has a greater hold on public attention.” Such are the words of the Holy Father.

In Europe, where the antagonism between capital and labor is well-marked and unrelenting, where the hatred of the disinherited towards the wealthier class is both intense and bitter, none can fail to understand the meaning of these solemn words; but in this country, where no immediate conflict of a bloody character is apprehended, we might possibly be disposed to let the warning of the Pope remain unheeded. On the part of the laity, this would be a serious error; but on the part of the clergy, it would amount to a grievous dereliction of duty. Every priest has a moral influence which he can scarcely realize. Both rich and poor come to him for comfort and guidance, both expect to learn from him their moral and religious obligations. He must show the working-man that he loves him as a brother, but without holding up delusive hopes or winking at communistic principles. He must treat the employer with due consideration,—for he must be all in all to win all to Christ,—but without minimizing the duties of wealth or blinking the abuses which often accompany its possession. The priest cannot be either a demagogue or a servant of Mammon. To follow the *media via*, without ever swerving from it, is not always an easy task, requiring as it does, from God’s minister a thorough understanding of the principles which must rule the intercourse of rich and poor, employer

and employee. The encyclical is not only the most authoritative, it is also the most masterly exposition of those principles. It must not merely be read, but studied, until its teachings are thoroughly assimilated. Moreover the success of our ministry requires unity of thought and harmony of action. Should we waste a part of our energy in profitless conflicts, our prestige would fail, and our authority would cease to be respected. Where shall we seek the source of our common inspiration and of Catholic unity, but where Christ Himself has placed the centre of Catholic teaching and Catholic jurisdiction?

Authority of the Encyclical.

Is this pontifical utterance a document *ex cathedra*? A theologian might hold the affirmative, and bring very good reasons to the support of his opinion. Let us apply the tests given by the Vatican Council, Session IV. and Chapter IV. First, Leo XIII. undoubtedly speaks as the Head of the Church and in order to fulfil his exalted functions. Secondly, the Pope addresses the whole Church through the divinely appointed teachers (*venerabilibus fratribus . . . universi orbis*). Thirdly, he proclaims truths which unquestionably belong to morals, (*Cum et religionis custodia et earum rerum quæ in Ecclesiæ potestate sunt, penes nos potissimum dispensatio sit . . . Ecclesia est, quæ promit ex Evangelio doctrinas, quarum virtute etc. . . . Eadem est quæ non instruere mentem tantummodo, sed regere vitam et mores præceptis suis contendit*). Fourthly, the doctrine which the Holy Father proclaims is to be held by all; for he plainly says that by being reticent he would seem to neglect his high trust (*officium neglexisse videamur*). He speaks with full authority (*plane jure nostro*), bearing in mind the cause of the Church and the salvation of all (*salute omnium*); he wants those principles to be carried into practice at once and by all (*Accingendum ad suas cuique partes, et maturrime quidem*).

There seems to be a strong case on the affirmative side, yet the absence of the formulas which are commonly found in definitions; the forbearance of the Pope, who does not explicitly condemn any definite proposition; the general tone, which is rather argumentative and philosophical than imperative and dogmatic,—all these cast a doubt, not on the certainty of the doctrine, but on the intention of the Pope to define it. We will not attempt to solve the question. To those whom God has made the custodians of the Catholic belief must be left the final settlement of the doubt.

Were it proven that the encyclical is a document *ex cathedra*, it would not follow that all the parts of it are defined. Theologians tell us that the infallibility of the Church does not throw its mantle over all the parts of a document where a final judgment is recorded. The reasons which have led to the decision, mere explanations, incidental matters, things mentioned *obiter*, must be received with great respect, owing to the source from which they emanate; but they are not, as a rule, supposed to be defined. On the other hand, if it be assumed that the Sovereign Pontiff proposed the doctrine without *defining* it, it does not follow that it can be questioned by true Catholics, *absque ulla catholice professionis jactura*. (We borrow the words from the Encyclical “*Quanta Cura*,” issued by Pius IX., December 8, 1864). The Pope undoubtedly states it as the teaching of the Church, and of that teaching, he is the authoritative exponent, *testis authenticus*. Moreover, we must bear in mind the solemn warning contained in the last lines of the dogmatic constitution “*De Fide Catholica*,” which was solemnly promulgated on the 24 day of April, 1870.

“As it is not enough to shun heretical depravity, unless those errors be carefully avoided which approach heresy more or less closely, we warn all the faithful of the duty which binds them to observe all the constitutions and decrees in which false opinions, not here mentioned explicitly, are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See.” Thus

thanks to the infallible teaching of the Church, we stand on well defined ground; and if struggle we must, we know what is to be cast away, and what must be held unto death.

What is Socialism? From what Sources does it Spring?

Anything like a complete exposition of the nature of socialism would be impossible within the limits of this paper. We shall content ourselves with a few short definitions.

Communism is a system which does away with every kind of private property; its axiom is *Individual property is robbery*.

Socialism does not condemn every kind of individual ownership, but would transfer to the state all the means of production. Now, if we abstract from *Labor*, which is essentially individual, the means of production are the bounty of nature, and especially *Land*, and that part of wealth which is devoted to production, that is, *Capital*. Karl Marx advocates the nationalization of Capital; John Stuart Mill, the nationalization of Land.

There are many other forms of socialism which we need not describe in this paper, because the encyclical is not directed against them. Yet the Socialism of the Chair, or Professional Socialism, which is advocated by some professors of political economy, and which is substantially the same as state socialism, receives from the Pope a passing notice. This theory (improperly called socialism) advocates increasing the attributions of the state until the central power encroaches on family rights and individual liberty. It is sometimes called the System of Paternal Government, because, if it were carried into practice, the state would assume, with regard to its subjects, some parental rights and some parental duties. In the encyclical both communism and socialism, properly so-called, are thoroughly refuted, and principles are laid down which enable us to detect and avoid the errors of state socialism.

At the very outset, the Pope sums up the conditions, both social and economic, which have created an antagonism be-

tween capital and labor, and thereby have fostered the growth of socialism. First comes the extraordinary development of industry. To understand the influence of this factor, we must observe first that it has displaced the wealth centre. During the middle ages, most of the wealth consisted in land values: now it consists chiefly in fixed or circulating capital. The fertility of the land constituted national as well as private riches: now the output of factories denotes the rise and fall of individual and of public prosperity. Take the statistics of any great industrial or commercial nation, and it will be seen at once that the landed interest has lost its supreme sway. This means that country life, country labor, and country homes are exchanged for the questionable pleasures, the feverish activity, and the tenement houses of a crowded city. It means frequent gluts of the labor market, remorseless competitions, alternatives of wasteful prosperity and of hopeless indigence. Secondly, it has created a consuming thirst for riches, raised hopes that can never be fulfilled, and strewn the industrial field with countless victims that could not bear the strain which had been put upon them. No doubt, the rapid development of industry is in itself an excellent thing; it multiplies enormously the resources of a community. But it has its deceptions. Those who fail, through circumstances, through vice, or through want of thrift, think that society is all wrong; and when they are not checked by strong religious convictions, they turn socialists. The third cause is the rapid transformation of industry, *novis cuncte itineribus artes*. Modern industry is characterized, first, by the constant introduction of new inventions and new machines, with the natural consequence that labor also must be transformed, and that a good many laborers are unable to adapt themselves to ever-changing conditions; secondly, by the predominance of factory labor, with its attendant relaxation of family ties; thirdly, by an increasing division of labor, which rivets the workman to a dull and

monotonous task; fourthly, by the concentration of capital, which greatly enhances its productiveness, but, by crushing competition, acquires a sort of irresponsible supremacy. Do not tell a workman who has lost a good position, owing to some new improvement, "My dear fellow, it will be all right in the end; for all these changes develop production to an enormous extent." "Perhaps," he will answer, "but, in the meantime, distribution is all wrong. When we have the power we shall take good care of distribution."—That man is ready to accept the theories of socialism.

A fourth cause is found in the *altered conditions of master and workman*. Labor is no more considered as the fulfilment of a divine commandment, which brings in its train an interchange of services and a diffusion of wealth; it has lost its dignity, and become an object of barter, a *commodity*, as economists call it. The employer thinks he has fully met the requirements of justice when he has paid the price agreed upon, in whatever manner he may have secured the contract: and, on the other hand, the workman thinks that a minimum of labor is all that can be required of him. Community of interest between master and workman is becoming the exception: hard bargaining is the rule. Moreover, the true notion of apprenticeship is fast becoming obsolete. The young workman does not see in his master one who stands *loco parentis*, but a sort of exacting despot, who wishes to wring out of a youngling as much cheap labor as possible. Mutual suspicion and mutual dislike spring up early, moral training is not there to correct these feelings, and a deep-seated antagonism is the consequence. Of course, the condition of affairs is not always as bad as we describe it, human kindness is not a thing of the past; yet selfishness is a growing evil, and it accounts for the prevalence of many dangerous errors.

Next come the *enormous fortunes of individuals and the poverty of the masses*. We know that the condensation of capital is a necessity of modern industry; we know also

that, in this country at least, the masses are not becoming poorer; but yet it is true that sometimes the wealthy needlessly flaunt their wealth before the eyes of the poor, that those who are unable to keep up the struggle sink into hopeless destitution, and that the contrast between the extremely rich and the extremely poor is calculated to rouse the bitterest feelings and to conjure up the most dangerous theories.

The increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population are excellent in themselves; but if you take away the check of religion and morality, they become the sources of new dangers. The workmen are conscious of two things: they have the power of numbers, and if they could but save, and combine sufficiently, they might eventually secure, not individually but collectively, the preponderance of wealth. Out of the produce of a large enterprise, about forty-five per cent goes to pay the laborers, whilst the capital invested seldom reaps more than five per cent. It is true that combinations are commonly short-lived, that saving is extremely difficult, and that a concentration of savings sufficient to increase their capital offers almost insuperable difficulties; yet these things are not absolutely impossible. The workingman knows it, and the dreams of socialism do not seem to him unreal.

We can but hint at some of the thoughts which the words of the Holy Father suggest. Whoever considers the matter carefully, and watches closely the course of events, will see how well-founded is the assertion, "The elements of a conflict are unmistakable." Two forces might ward it off,—a deep respect for moral laws, and a system of guilds permeated with Christian principles. But "moral deterioration" is going on. "The ancient workmen's guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organization has taken their place." Do not these last words suggest a remedy? The ancient guilds are probably gone forever, but Christian associations of workingmen, adapted to modern

conditions, are not only possible, but perfectly practicable. Some are already in existence. Either the clergy will help to mould them and will breathe into them the spirit of life or the workingmen will drift away from the Church, and become the prey of designing demagogues.

"By degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition." Such is the result of the much-abused *Laisses faire*. So small is at times the margin of profit that the slightest miscalculation may cause the downfall of apparently prosperous enterprises; nor is it always without reason that capitalists declare that they cannot do more for their workmen without being distanced by unscrupulous or better equipped competitors. "The evil has been increased by rapacious usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different form but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious, grasping men."

The Church has never condemned a legal rate of interest, which is the natural and legitimate result of the transformation of wealth into capital; but usury, even when apparently checked by law, can assume many shapes under which it is not easily recognized. In order to make the just rebuke of the Pope better understood, let us tear away one of those hundred disguises. In some places the workmen are supposed to be paid regularly at the end of the month; but when the end of the month comes, they are told to wait a few days. In the meantime the money draws interest at the laborer's expense. Moreover, the workingman, having no money to purchase the necessities of life, is compelled to go to the company's store, or to other establishments that pay to the company a tribute which amounts to five or even ten per cent. Who pays that ten per cent? The workman. This form of usury may be uncommon, but it is not either impossible or imaginary, for we have seen it practised more than once. "A small number of very rich men have been

able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself." We believe that this yoke is not as heavy in America as in older commonwealths, yet it is galling enough to call for some remedy, and that remedy "must be quickly found."

Socialistic Nostrum both Unjust and Worthless.

"The remedy can be easily found," says the disciple of Marx. "Nationalize capital, that powerful instrument of production; let the state be both producer and distributor." "This would be robbery," answers the disciple of Mill, "all comes ultimately from the Land. Nationalize the Land and all will be well." Specious doctrines for those who are distanced in the race for wealth, but as unavailing as they are unjust. "Their proposals," says the Holy Father, "are so clearly futile for all practical purposes that if they were carried out, the workingman himself would be among the first to suffer." For in order to better his condition, the workman must be able to lay aside some part of his earnings and to turn what he has saved into capital or invest it in land; moreover, he must feel perfectly certain that the little estate he has purchased or the little money he has laid by shall remain his own, to dispose of it as he may judge fit. Take away this security, tell him that when he shall have acquired either land or capital, the state will take charge of his earnings, and you take away from him, together with the hope of bettering his condition, the incentive to save, you have struck at the root of production. "The socialists, therefore, in endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interest of every wage-earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life." To these words an economist would probably add that the state is, by its nature, a consumer, not a producer; that when a government attempts to produce, it is generally more waste-

ful, owing chiefly to the exigencies of politics, than a private company would be; that the produce is generally obtained by raising loans or taxes, and consequently cannot be truly said to be an accession to the capital of the country. Should the state own both land and capital, the most monstrous monopoly ever dreamed of would start into existence; private enterprises would be at an end, liberty would become a thing of the past, and civilization would begin a backward movement.

After showing that the workman would be the first to suffer if the dreams of socialism are ever realized, the Holy Father proves directly that its pretended panacea is, not only worthless, but contrary to justice. This part does not seem to need any explanation; it is a most lucid and powerful statement of the Catholic theology of the question. We may say, with his Grace, the Archbishop of New York: "The Sovereign Pontiff adopts the common teaching of theologians, and, so to say, canonizes it, making it the teaching of the Catholic Church."

There is, however, a point which requires special attention, both because it is not always sufficiently understood, and because it involves a principle which throws great light on the theory of right and on the laws of sociology.

The Holy Father proves first that the right of permanent domain, in land as well as capital, belongs to man, because, "possessing reason, it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living beings have them" but "to have them in stable and permanent possession;" and also because, "comprehending by the power of his reason things innumerable, and joining the future with the present, he governs himself by the foresight of his counsel. . . . Man's needs do not die out. . . . Nature therefore owes to man a storehouse that shall never fail." Then he makes the following important statement: "Nor must we, at this stage, have recourse to the state. Man is older than the state and he holds the right

of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any state."

Again, the Holy Father proves the right of ownership from the fact that man can *impress his personality* on land by effective occupancy, and from the nature of land considered economically, that is to say, as a factor of production. "For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition. . . . That which has thus altered the soil, giving it new value, becomes so truly a part of it as to be in a great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's sweat and labor should be enjoyed by another? As the effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to him who has labored." With a very simple alteration, this last reasoning might be extended to the so-called unearned increment. As the accident follows the substance, it is just and right that the accident should belong to him who owns the substance.

After observing that the Catholic doctrine fully justifies the common opinion and practice of mankind, the Pope derives another proof from the functions of man as head of a family, and then makes the following remark which completes the statement to which we have previously drawn attention. "Since the domestic household is anterior, both in idea and in fact, to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on nature." The importance of these principles of natural law will be better understood when we devote our attention to the sociology of the encyclical.

The scriptural proofs have not been neglected by the Holy Father, but they do not seem to call for any special comment.

Let us conclude with the following words of the Sovereign Pontiff which are in perfect harmony with the teachings of standard economists: "Our first and most funda-

mental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property."

R. J. HOLAIND, S. J.

THE EIGHTH CENTENARY OF ST. BERNARD.

"Let us now praise men of renown, and our
Fathers in their Generation.

Such as have borne rule in their dominions,
men of great power—whose godly deeds have
not failed: Good things continue with their
seed.

Let the people show forth their wisdom and
the Church declare their praise."

Ecclesiastic. Chap. xlv.

I.

THE present year marks the eighth centenary since the birth of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.¹ In an age of Saints St. Bernard was eminently the saint of his age. He stands as the central reflector of his time, the figure which, luminous with the light of divine charity, drew upon itself the eyes of the contemporary world and fascinated all classes in such a manner as to control and direct the confused and factious elements into harmonious activity for the common good. Like Gregory the Great, St. Bernard was practically the ruler, the judge of appeal in Church and State, whose counsels and will governed the powers of Europe during the twelfth century and, in truth, long after.

Yet, unlike Gregory, he was a poor monk, one who had

¹ Some writers place the date as doubtful between the end of 1090 and the early part of 1091. The Roman Calendar gives the feast of the Saint on the 20th August, which is the day of his death.

renounced the world in a way far more emphatic than the thousand solitaries who after his pattern sought the wilderness of Clairvaux, pledged by solemn vow never to look back. He enjoyed no rank or dignity which might have given him prestige with the great, or commanded the obedience of the masses whom he swayed at will. His early education had been wholly devoid of those elements of training which fit men for the world. He was an amiable child and intelligent and industrious; but according to his biographers there was about him a marked simplicity and he appeared continually drawn toward solitude. *We find the same traits pronounced throughout his later life. He could hardly be induced to speak in public, although no one ever did so with greater success. One of the *opuscula* with which every ecclesiastical student is familiar, is a sermon delivered to the clergy of Paris, entitled "De Conversione ad clericos sermo." When the Bishop asked the Saint to address the priests of the city, he refused, saying, he did not want to appear in public unless necessity compelled him. But the next morning he sent word that he would do the Bishops will.¹ And then the poor monk undertook to chastise unmercifully the ambition and luxury of the metropolitan clergy.

In spite of all this he was deemed the oracle of his day and the most astute statesmen accounted their political wisdom as nothing aside of the deliberate and clear-headed counsel of the saint. There is an inscription upon the tomb of the Abbot Suger, friend of St. Bernard, which reads:

Rex per eum caute rexit moderamine regni:

Ille regens regem, rex quasi regis erat.

¹ Gaufridus factum narrat in libro V. de vita Sancti, num. 10: "Patrem sanctum, fines Parisiorum aliquando peragrantem, ut ad ipsam diverteret civitatem, episcopus Stephanus, et cæteri omnes qui pariter aderant, obnixe rogantes non poterant obtinere. Magno quidem zelo, nisi causa gravis urgeret, conventus publicos declinabat. Cumque vespere iter suum alias destinasset, mane, ubi primum locutus est fratribus, dicere jubet episcopo, quia Parisiis ibimus, ut rogasti. Conveniente igitur clero admodum copioso, etc."

This might be applied with double force to our saint who in large measure directed the government of the immortal prime minister of Louis VII. of France. His soft sweet voice (for his contemporaries have given him the name of ("mellifluous Doctor") was capable of arousing the enthusiasm of all Europe to undertake a crusade which not only saved the states from revolution and anarchy, but shaped the restless energies of the nations into positive vehicles of Christian thought and a beneficent civilization, which raised the arts and sciences to a height which had been otherwise impossible.

And if we ask, whence came this marvellous power of a single man, without wealth or position or any claim which the world is accustomed to respect in those who attempt to rule its affairs? Cardinal Manning answers the question:¹ "Not from the training and schooling of this world, but from the instincts, simplicity and penetration of a mind profoundly immersed in God, and from a will of which the fervor and singleness of aim were supernatural." Assuredly. This power, this elevation is not distinct from the true humility of the saints. It is a law in physics and morals alike, that he who would lift a thing, must get under. The worldly wise attend to the mechanism of things; they arrange springs which at a touch set the machinery in action. But if the spring refuse to yield, if some tooth break in the main wheel or some unforeseen element enters to disturb the movement, they are at a loss. St. Bernard's hand "was laid, not upon the mechanism of society, but upon the motive powers which originate and sustain its action."²

II.

Within the present century, fully seven hundred years after his canonization, St. Bernard is solemnly proclaimed a "Doctor of the Universal Church." This is apparently

¹ See Preface to Ratisbonne's *Life of St. Bernard*.

² *Loc. cit. ibid.*

strange. The schoolmen have always recognized our saint as one of the leading and unquestioned teachers of Catholic doctrine. They have called him from the beginning Doctor of the Church by a sort of universal consent favored by the liturgy which always assigned to the saint the mass and prayers reserved for Doctors and Confessors. Mabillon, and many after him, rank St. Bernard not only as a Doctor but as one of the Fathers of the Church, "*ultimus inter Patres*," and thus place him above St. Thomas of Aquin and St. Bonaventure. These two, although they lived fully a century later had been solemnly titled Doctors of the Universal Church long before.¹

Why this delay in the case of St. Bernard? If the merits of great men are recognized history does not wait for centuries to add to their name the title of "Great." What meaning can there be in the Church doling out her honors to St. Bernard in so tardy a manner when from the outset she gives her own testimony to the fact that they are justly due? The answer is simply this, that the Church does not measure with the measure of the world. She does not honor her children, who have gained their crown of victory, for their sake but rather for the sake of the struggling brethren who are still in the race; who blinded with the dust around them are looking upward for some mark to guide them, for some voice to cheer, some hand to beckon on from the conqueror's high stand aside of the king. When a saint is raised upon our altars, the Church says: Behold, learn to love and imitate what is so fair and comes to so beautiful an issue. When she proclaims any of her saints as a doctor of all the Church, she would say: Study him, learn the lessons he taught and has left in his writings, for they are specially needful to all in this age.

In this respect the Church follows out the same line of action taken in the definition of dogmatic truths. She only

¹ St. Thomas by Const. of Pius V., 1567, and St. Bonaventure by Const. of Sixtus V., 1588.

emphasizes old and acknowledged facts of faith. She unfolds them, defines their different bearings and thus protects her children against misleading innovations. She is a living organism. Her doctrine expands in proportion to the growing needs of the human race for whose benefit the apostolic germ was intended. This expansion, this doctrinal development from within cannot be called a change unless in the same sense as the young tree changes by adding branch on branch with fresh blossom and fruit each year. There is but one root, nourishing all the parts of trunk and crown, all the growth is heavenward in harmonious variety. To sustain this growth from below columns are added sound and strong which uphold the branches nourished from on high.

Such is the meaning of the creation of the Doctors of the Church. Such is the meaning of St. Bernard proclaimed as Doctor of the universal Church in the nineteenth century.

But has not St. Bernard long ago outlived the usefulness which the intelligent historian will readily allow for him as a teacher in medieval days? The "Dark Ages" even if not quite so dark as has been described by the bearers of ephemeral light in later times, surely cannot present a claim to teach us in these enlightened days of the nineteenth century. The monastic principle has no longer the same hold upon the religious world as in the twelfth century and the crude scholasticism of St. Bernard offers no counterpart to the elastic systems of the modern philosophic schools. In politics as in religion and science we have advanced from the old methods with such rapid strides that the principle of individual rule is being quickly effaced even where it had laid deepest hold upon the popular mind.

Yet, strange as it may seem, there is a wonderful parallel in the flow of historic events and the current of popular feeling between the twelfth and the nineteenth century. History ever repeats itself. Though figures may change, the plot returns periodically, as if Time had but two strokes whereby to announce its passing presence: Rise and Fall. The

age of St. Bernard was marked by a strong anti-monarchical movement on the part of the people. The arrogance of temporal rulers and the corruption of a half secularized clergy roused the consciousness of their rightful freedom among those who had become accustomed to toil and suffer in order to sustain a useless and tyrannical aristocracy. The municipalities everywhere gathered their forces and proclaimed their independence. The southern half of Europe became studded with small Republics. Each city ruled itself. Bishops were elected by the people and, amid the enthusiasm of a new and untrammelled activity, prosperity gained everywhere. But wherever those changes were the result of a violent reaction it was but natural that the immediate good results should be shortlived unless men could be found who might prevent the seething masses from boiling over. Just laws applied with that moderation which makes up the successful wisdom of great rulers are no less a condition of true liberty than is the emancipation from unjust oppression. Our own North American Republic which owes so much to the liberty loving wisdom of Washington as a legislator and ruler is the most striking example of this truth possibly to be found in the whole history of state origins ancient or modern.

There were in the twelfth century, as there have always been under similar conditions of society, men of irreproachable character, anxious for the dominion of good, energetic and gifted leaders. But their restless spirit would not brook delays. They did not believe in the cure of the sickly body by the slow but sure process of a well regulated diet and moderate exercise. They were ready to amputate the defective organs and to subject the system to the Russian method of kill or cure. Usually the popular voice applauds such extremists, especially if the object in view is apparently good and promises a bettering of the condition of the masses. A type of these reformers, at the time we speak of, was Arnold of Brescia. Enthusiastic, severe in his mode of

life, he would have others like to himself. When the cry of liberty arose, he at once took it up. It was easy to find the reason of the abject condition against which the people rose up, in the lives of those who ruled in church or state. The glowing appeals made to the unthinking masses who became quickly intoxicated with a false notion of liberty, soon sent broadcast over the lands the sparks which would ultimately light the torch of revolt against all authority, even that which is essential to the preservation of order and happiness. As Rome was the centre of authority so Rome became the centre of the reaction. The eternal city assumed once more the title of a republic as in prechristian days; the people elected a Senate and a Patrician who was to do service in place of the ancient Consul; and how strongly went the current against the old order of things was shown in the fact that the sovereign pontiff Lucius II. was killed amid a popular tumult by the throw of a stone.

Who can tell in what this self-destroying movement would have ultimately ended, if St. Bernard had not understood how to divert the monstrous energy which was forming about him to the destruction of social and moral order. Eugene III., friend and disciple of St. Bernard, a monk like himself and formed in the school of Citeaux had been elected pope and resided an exile at Viterbo. From him proceeded the call and when the gentle solitary of Clairvaux had received the mission, his weak frame and voice assumed the strength of a giant. Everywhere the sound of the Cross echoed and impelled the enthusiastic crowds to take part in a holier cause than that which had engrossed them hitherto. The reckless and ambitious demagogues who, having seen in the popular uprising their momentary opportunity of being borne aloft, sank into insignificance aside of the attenuated figure of the white robed monk, who appealed to the throngs around in the name of a higher liberty than that of earth; who pointed out to them the common enemy of their faith and brought them back to a sense of their own wrongs

which they might now expiate in the defence of the holy sepulchre against the barbarous aggression of the Turk.

This was the effect immediate and of paramount importance which the second crusade brought about. It was the inauguration of a struggle for liberty in which personal animosity and private ambition of Churchmen and princes were merged and forgotten. And when the sufferings of the expedition and the sight of the evils which come from dissension had sobered the minds of rulers and people, St. Bernard was still there to teach them the application of the lesson and to show in speech and writing how all order is the basis of social peace and prosperity; and how order is impossible without law and authority to guard it.

III.

It almost carries us too far to go into any details of St. Bernard's further history. Nevertheless it is important for the completion of our study to call attention to the Saint's position in regard to the intellectual movement of his time. If we had to characterize the intellectual history of this period in one sentence we should say that it was a struggle of believing reason against reasonable faith. The most notable exponent of the former was Peter Abelard. The champion of the latter was Bernard of Clairvaux. Abelard, keen, powerful, brilliant, disdaining the ways of the schools in which the more solid minds professed themselves to have been trained hitherto, opened a new way to the attainment of knowledge. His was a call for liberty of speculation which losing sight of the boundaries of revelation leaped over into fields which threatened the destruction of positive faith. He inaugurated an intellectual movement in all things analogous to that which we have sketched as occurring in the social and political order. "His teaching" says the gifted author of *Christian Schools and Scholars* "bore the character of his own restless and impatient genius. Disdainful of anything which did not promise quick results, he

aimed at presenting his disciples with a philosophy which professed to lead them to the possession of wisdom by a royal road. . . . The effect of these new doctrines was to inaugurate a scholastic revolution."¹ Abelard had swung himself into this position as teacher by the force of personal attraction. He had only attended Anselm's school for a time and "at once began to teach a science which in reality he had never studied."² No doubt Abelard effected his share of good. His own extremes went a considerable way to weaken the extravagant assertions of William of Champeaux who maintained an excessive realism in the famous discussions on "universals." But the subtle and yet ambiguous distinctions of the former as regards the relation of faith and knowledge, not only place him in opposition to the scholastics but show him to differ from the orthodox view of Catholic theologians before and after him. Very aptly says Hertling of him :

"He annihilates the boundary between the natural and the supernatural, between the truths which are attainable by reason and which have been recognized by the pagan philosophers and the Christian doctrines which have reached us through revelation. Although he is forced to confess his very partial knowledge of the Greek philosophers they seem to him nevertheless to stand above some of the prophets of the Old Law. A natural consequence of this assumption is to give a rationalistic coloring to the mysteries of faith. Thus his construction of the Trinity out of the divine omnipotence, wisdom, and love, if consequentially reduced to its ultimate analysis, leads to a mere modalism, which admits in the three divine persons simply a threefold manifestation of the one divine substance."³

Against this spirit St. Bernard set himself to argue and to write ; and history has recorded how his gentle power finally triumphed not only over the influence but over the mind and heart of Abelard. Thus, if we separate the underlying principle which animated the entire activity of the

¹ Op. cit. Cap. XII. pag. 349.

² Ibid.

³ Wetzer u. Welte's Kirchuel. *Abelard*, p. 17.

saintly monk at Clairvaux we find it to be a vindication of legitimate authority. He is opposed on the one hand to an excessive secularism which threatens to subject the religious to the civil rule. On the other hand he combats the rationalistic tendency which under plea of freedom of investigation subjects faith and revelation to the criticism of individual reason. And in his defence of the rights of the Church, St. Bernard was by no means one sided. No one has more openly and fearlessly chastised existing abuses among the hierarchy or the lower orders of the monastic and secular clergy; and in this he stands in singular contrast to the fanatical preachers of his day who saw no other remedy for the flagrant corruption around them, than to incite the discontented masses to open revolt.

IV.

But history surely repeats itself. Though the "Dark Ages" have passed away and left in their stead an enlightened nineteenth century—civilization, six hundred years of fitful and progressive changes have brought back the identical plot. The stage is lit up with more brilliant jets; the costumes are new; the names in the repertory are changed, and the orchestra plays other tunes than of old. But it is the same story after all. At the beginning of the present century we find Rome once more a republic. The aged Pius VI. is exiled, dragged from the Vatican, first to Sienna, then to Florence, then to Valencia where he dies. Revolution is rife in France. Napoleon, first the champion of popular liberty, then the despot of Europe and lastly the exiled slave, demonstrates the awful fortune of him who raises his hand against the anointed Vicar of Christ; Pius VII. and Leo XII. bear witness in their allocutions to the unsettled condition of Europe, in civil matters the very counterpart of the early twelfth century.

Within the Church the germs of schism are breeding. The Abbé de Trevaux with others hold that Pius VII. had

committed a grievous error in accepting the terms of the Concordat of 1801, and that the church was no longer the apostolic Church of old. * Then De Lamennais in France and Hermes in Germany, though combatting each other in their doctrines, tend in the same direction, the subversion of authority. The one teaches the supremacy of "universal reason;" the other exalts reason above faith. Substantially they repeat the principles of Abelard, only more boldly and emphatically. To their teaching may we trace the present attitude of intellectual men outside of Christianity towards revelation. Naturalism, so called, was the first fruits of the system of biblical criticism formulated by Eichhorn and Paulus, and popularized by Strauss and Rénan.

Applied to the moral order this system has produced the sceptic disposition of the middle class in society, asserting that moral independence which claims religion as a necessity for the low and ignorant to the exclusion of the educated classes. But the masses claim equality and hence we obtain as a legitimate result of the intellectual errors taught in the earlier half of the present century, liberalism on one side and socialism on the other.

All this Pius VIII. clearly saw and foresaw. He sat but one year upon the pontifical throne; but in that short time he has shown both his moderation (especially in his dealings with the French clergy and government) and his desire to see freedom established among the people of all nations.¹ But he felt that to go to the root of the evils of the day and to prevent them bearing bitter fruits in times to come, legislation was not enough. It needed some agency that would turn the tide of thought and feeling into new channels, that would rouse fresh enthusiasm and thus educate the masses for the acceptance of principles which might counteract the prevailing tendency. For this reason he raised up a new, or at least forgotten ideal. He turned the attention of the

¹ We refer to his efforts for the abolition of slave holding in Brazil and to his defence of the Armenian Catholics.

learned and the good, who might act as leaders, to the contemplation of St. Bernard, his actions and his doctrines and the wonderful fruits both bore in times when they were accepted.

Such was the meaning of the act by which St. Bernard was solemnly proclaimed a Doctor of the Universal Church. And this act has not yet lost its significance and power. If the celebration of Centenaries has any worthy object it is to revive the effects of those grand supernatural principles which the heroes whom we commemorate embodied in their lives and teaching.

Need we add how necessary this is to-day in regard to the principle which St. Bernard, whom his contemporaries styled "Flos Cleri—Legis sanctio—Juris amor," represented. "*Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Et: Qui potestati resistit Dei ordinationi resistit. Quam tamen sententiam cupio vos et omnimodis moneo custodire in exhibenda reverentia summa et Apostolicæ sedi et beati Petri Vicario, sicut ipsam vobis vultis ab universo servari imperio.*" (St. Bern. ad Conrad. Ep. circ. an. 1130.)

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

Corneli, in U. T. Libros Sacros, vol. 3.

Godet, Saint Luke, 1888. Introduction.

Reuss, History of the New Testament, translated by E. L. Houghton, Boston, 1884.

Weiss, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, transl. by A. F. R. Davidson, New York, 1889.

Weiss, the Life of Christ, transl. by J. W. Hope, Edinburgh, 1883.

Westcott, An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, London, 1888.

Fillion, Introduction Générale aux Evangiles, Paris, 1889.

Bacuez, Manuel Biblique, t. 3. Paris, 1884.

AN event narrated by two distinct writers usually presents two entirely different pictures. Our daily papers prove to evidence that independent reports of the same incident agree hardly in a single phrase; even the general outline and the material of one differ from the plan and the substance of another. With this fact before us, we are enabled to understand the first part of what we have called the Synoptic Problem. The gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. Mark, known as the synoptic gospels, are professedly different reports of the Life of Jesus; still they agree most strikingly in plan, in incident and even in language. Excepting the History of the Infancy, the three Evangelists follow the same course of narrative: the Preparation for the Public Life, the History of the Baptist, the Baptism, the Temptation, the Ministry in Galilee, the Journey to Jerusalem, the Passion and the Resurrection, these are the incidents described by the three writers in the same succession.

The coincidences of the Synoptists are not less striking when we consider the filling up of the above general outlines. If we divide the first three gospels into 562 parts, as

Eusebius has done, 184 of these parts are found in the three Evangelists, 73 are common to St. Matthew and St. Mark, 104 are found in both St. Matthew and St. Luke, 14 are common to St. Mark and St. Luke. According to a more accurate calculation two fifths of the contents of the synoptic gospels are common to the three Evangelists, while the sum of all that is peculiar to one or another of them amounts to only one third. St. Mark's gospel, e. g., counts not more than 24 verses to which no parallel exists in St. Matthew or St. Luke.

The verbal coincidences of the three synoptic gospels are of course not as numerous as the agreements in plan and incident. Thus a little less than one sixth of the gospel of St. Matthew verbally agrees with either of the other two synoptic gospels. The verbal coincidences in St. Luke form about one tenth of the whole gospel, and in St. Mark about one sixth. It must also be noted that the verbal coincidences are most frequent in those parts of the gospels in which speeches are related, while they are very scarce in the narrative parts.

To state the Synoptic Problem briefly, the following questions require an answer: 1. Why do the three synoptic gospels narrate only the Galilean ministry, and why do they select precisely the same deeds and speeches of Jesus, omitting other deeds and speeches of the highest importance and interest, such as the Eucharistic Sermon, related by St. John? 2. How did it come to pass that the three writers followed the same plan, and frequently employed the same words, though they did not record even the recitative parts in their original Aramaic? 3. How can we account for the most striking dissimilitude in passages which from the nature of the subject should be most similar to one another?

The various ways in which the problem has thus far been solved are reducible to three: 1. The system of mutual dependence; 2. the system of written sources; 3. the system of oral sources. The method which endeavored to

solve the difficulty by appealing to the fact of divine inspiration, has no longer any adherents worthy of consideration. It may indeed account for the unimpeachable truthfulness of the gospels, but cannot serve to explain the human element in their composition.

The first of the above systems is by some said to date back to St. Augustine¹ who calls St. Mark the abbreviator and the follower of St. Matthew. But these words are explained by Baronius and Cornelius a Lapide as meaning that St. Mark has written after St. Matthew and narrated the identical incidents contained in the first gospel, only in a shorter form. Others, however, understand St. Augustine to mean that St. Mark made a compendium of the gospel of St. Matthew which he had actually before him; St. Luke then used the gospels of both St. Matthew and St. Mark. Grotius, Mill,² Bengel, Wetstein, T. Townson,³ Seiler,⁴ Aeshimann,⁵ Hennel,⁶ Hilgenfeld,⁷ G. d'Eichthal,⁸ have one and all adopted this explanation. Father Corneli⁹ gives a list of Catholic scholars who have held or who still hold the same view. Among its numerous defenders are Hug, Patrizi, Danko, Reithmayer, Valroger, Coleridge, Schanz, Bacuez. Different explanations are however given of minor details; Cardinal Patrizi, e. g., thinks that St. Mark made use of the Aramaic text of St. Matthew, while the Greek translator of the latter Evangelist had St. Mark's gospel before his eyes. Schanz and others are of opinion that the later Evangelists made use of other sources, both written and unwritten, besides the prior gospels; Reithmayer and Valroger maintain that, at least, oral tradition was relied on by the later writers of the gospels.

Other scholars agreeing with the above named in the

¹ De consens. Evang. 1, 2.

² Proleg. 109.

³ Discourses on the four Gospels, Oxf. 1778.

⁴ De tempore et ordine evv. 1832.

⁵ Origine des trois pr. evv. Gen. 1832. ⁶ Ursprung des Christenthums, p. 72. ff.

⁷ In several works and articles in the Zeitschrift. ⁸ Les Evangiles 1863, 2 vls.

⁹ Introductio, v. 3. p. 179.

general assumption that the coincidences and differences of the synoptic gospels must be explained by the theory of mutual-dependence, disagree with them as to the order of such a dependence. To St. Matthew they assign the first place, but the second place is given to St. Luke, the third to St. Mark. St. Clement of Alexandria is said to be the parent of this opinion. It was revived by Griesbach, and has obtained the assent of Ad. Maier, I. Langen, and a few other Catholic scholars; among Protestants it enjoyed for a time the greatest favor, as appears from the list of its adherents given by Reusch in his history of the New Testament.¹ Among later writers, Strauss² and Hofman³ deserve most attention. According to Strauss, St. Matthew wrote his gospel from oral sources and in a Judaizing spirit, St. Luke wrote from a Pauline point of view, and St. Mark endeavored to reconcile the two tendencies.

A third explanation of the mutual-dependence theory makes St. Luke the earliest writer, and the other two synoptists his dependants. This opinion has never found much favor. It was held by Buesching,⁴ Evanson (1792) and Gfroerer,⁵ but is now generally abandoned.

A fourth class of scholars thought it very unlikely that a later writer should have omitted such valuable material as has been omitted in the gospel of St. Mark, if the fuller accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke had been at his command. Hence they inferred that St. Mark had written first, and that SS. Matthew and Luke depended on his gospel. Storr⁶ seems first to have proposed this theory. With various modifications it has gained numerous adherents in modern times. Volkmar⁷ conceives the origin of our

¹ Vol. I. p. 178.

² *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, 1864.

³ *Die heilige, Schrift N. T.*, 9, Theil, 1881.

⁴ *Die vier Evangelien*, Hamburg, 1776.

⁵ *Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1838.

⁶ *De fonte evv. Matth. et Luc.*, Tueb., 1794.

⁷ *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, 1866; *Die Evangelien, oder Markus und die Synopsis*, 1870.

second gospel as being due to a poetic view of the life of Jesus, written by the Pauline Christian Mark; after this account had been answered by a most emphatically Judaizing Christian in the primitive gospel of Matthew, the Pauline view was still more emphatically advocated by the third gospel. All that our ecclesiastical tradition knows of Christ, it has, according to Volkmar, received from these tendency-documents of the synoptic gospels. Ritschl¹ and Simons² have variously modified the above theory of a primitive Mark, but their labors need not be considered here at fuller length.

Wescott in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* has rightly insisted on the fact that its numerous modifications are in themselves a difficulty against the mutual-dependence theory. Again, such a dependence may account for the general coincidences of the synoptic gospels, but it does not explain the peculiar distribution of those coincidences, nor does it account for the differences between the three narratives. Why did the later Evangelist omit this or that detail given in the earlier record? why did he adhere to the words of his predecessor up to a certain limit and then suddenly abandon them? If the "synoptic gospels depend one on the other, there evidently must have been a fixed purpose in their divergence; now no designed purpose has as yet been discovered in the later gospels that will satisfactorily explain all the actual discrepancies.

Thus far we have considered only general deficiencies of the mutual-dependence theory; a more serious inconvenience arises from the fact that every possible modification of the theory has been successfully refuted by the arguments in favor of its other modifications: the gospels of Sts. Mark and Luke cannot depend on the gospel of St. Matthew because it seems entirely improbable that important events narrated by an eye-witness should have been omitted by the

¹ *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1850.

² *Hat der dritte Evangelist den Mattheus benutzt?* 1881.

later writers, and that the latter should have attempted to correct the chronology and the order of the former. If St. Luke depended on St. Matthew, could he have written the History of the Infancy of Jesus as he has done? Nor can we, on the other hand, assume that St. Matthew depended for his material on St. Luke or on St. Mark. Why should he, an eye-witness, borrow the facts for his Life of the Christ from sources which had received the same information by way of oral tradition? Besides all this, the very idea of such a mutual dependence is as foreign to the spirit of the Apostolic age, as it is to the tenets of Christian tradition.

The second theory advanced to solve the Synoptic Problem may be called the hypothesis of common written sources. As early as the year 1716 Johannes Clericus proposed the general outline of such a common dependence on written sources containing the speeches and the deeds of Jesus.¹ Lessing seems to have first tried the hypothesis of a primitive Aramaic gospel as the source of our present synoptic gospels. But on a closer examination, the Aramaic gospel was found to be less primitive than the first three gospels. Eichhorn modified Lessing's hypothesis in so far as to assume the existence of an Aramaic record of the deeds and words of Jesus which, according to him, had served as a common guide in the preaching of the Apostles and of the earliest disciples. In order to reconstruct it we have only to join the 42 sections, common to the first three Evangelists, into one continuous narrative. Eichhorn's hypothesis of itself did not account for the differences found in our present gospel texts, and had therefore to undergo various modifications. The primitive document [A] was supposed to have passed through various editions, called respectively, B, C, D, and these editions were supposed to have fallen into the hands of the three Synoptists.

¹ Hist. Eccl. duorum prim. sæc. Amstel. 1716. Lessing, Neue Hypothese uüber die Evangelien 1778.

The gospel of St. Matthew was explained as a Greek translation of the editions A. and D. combined; the third gospel had been formed in the same manner out of B. and D., while the second gospel followed the edition C., which was itself a combination of A. and B. And when with all this the *Greek* coincidences of the Synoptists could not be accounted for, Eichhorn admitted besides his four Aramaic editions, a Greek translation in two different editions.¹ Passing over the modifications of the theory proposed by Marsh and by Gratz,² we next meet Baur's theory according to which Matthew's Judaizing gospel of the Hebrews was the earliest written source; an absolute representative of Paulinism was opposed to this Judaizing gospel, and wrote in consequence the primitive gospel of Luke, perhaps our present third gospel. St. Mark wrote our second gospel in order to soften the contrast between St. Matthew and St. Luke and to reconcile the two opposite tendencies. Bleek and de Wette substituted instead of Eichhorn's theory that of a primitive Galilean gospel which served as common source for the two longer synoptic gospels, while the third short gospel of St. Mark is nothing but a compendium of the two former.³ Against this explanation militate not only all the difficulties which oppose Eichhorn's theory, but also the arguments by which it is proved that St. Mark cannot depend on St. Matthew.

After one common source of the three synoptic gospels had thus been found insufficient to solve the Synoptic Problem, Schleiermacher was the first to propose the theory of several written common sources. In his work "*Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unseren beiden ersten Evangelien*" the learned author endeavors to prove that the words

¹ Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur, 1794. V. p. 759. ff.; Einleitung ins N. T. Ed. 2. I. p. 353. ff.

² Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien zu erklären. Tübingen, 1814.

³ Einleitung.

⁴ Studien und Krit., 1832.

of Papias regarding the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark cannot apply to our present first and second gospels. According to the patristic writer the one gospel was written in Aramaic and contained only the speeches of Jesus without recording his deeds, while the other was a much less orderly account of the life of Jesus than we possess in our present second gospel. Credner started from the hypothesis of Schleiermacher and supposed that the Proto-Mark is the common source of the narrative portion of the three Synoptists, and in the Proto-Matthew he sees the source of those recitative parts that are common to St. Matthew and St. Luke.¹ Weisse differs from Credner in the one particular that he does not admit a Proto-Mark distinct from our present gospel of that Evangelist; the Proto-Matthew collection of speeches served, however, as common source.² Though many variations regarding the nature and the precise place of the Mark-document are found among the followers of Credner, it must still be granted that men of the greatest learning and ability have taken the defence of his cause. Reuss, Holtzman, Weizsaecker, Beyschlag, de Pressensé are a few of the illustrious adherents of Credner's school.

In spite of such an array of brilliant names, the theory itself suffers from the same weakness which we have noted in the mutual-dependence system. The arguments of the various factions destroy each other, so that final self-destruction is the ultimate result. Holtzman, e. g., has seen fit to abandon the hypothesis of a Proto-Mark entirely, while Beyschlag has found it necessary to admit two Proto-Marks instead of one. Reuss is of opinion that the gospel of the Proto-Mark is shorter and less complete than our gospel of St. Mark, and here he has not found a single follower worthy of note. Besides all this, the discrepancies of the synoptic gospels are no more explained by this theory than by the theory of

¹ Die synoptischen Evangelien, Einleitung, 1836.

² Evangelische Geschichte, 1838; Die Evangelien-Frage; 1856.

mutual dependence. For it is only by the most arbitrary manipulation of the text that such differences can have crept into our gospels, if their written sources were identical.

The same reasoning holds against that modification of the above theory, which endeavors to explain the difficulties of the Synoptic question by a combination of the theory of mutual-dependence with that of written sources. Weiss whose peculiar views have already been mentioned, initiated this system of gospel-study. Ewald, Meyer, Sabatier, Keil, Wendt, Grau, Lipsius and Weiss are some of his principal followers. The last named author¹ has proposed the theory in the most elaborate and scientific way. The principal source according to Weiss is the Proto-Matthew, containing not merely the speeches of Jesus, as had been held by the former scholars, but also an outline of his deeds. —St. Mark made use of both this document and the oral tradition which he received from the Apostle Peter. Our present gospel of St. Matthew as well as that of St. Luke depend on the same Proto-Matthew and on St. Mark; the former has furnished most of the matter, while the latter has suggested the plan and arrangement. St. Luke employed however a third source, containing the whole life of Jesus, from which document the third evangelist has taken all that material which is not contained in either St. Mark or the Proto-Matthew. Holtzmann too has changed his opinion of late in so far as to reject the Proto-Mark. St. Luke he supposes to depend on St. Matthew for all that material in which the first and the third gospels agree:

We need not repeat that according to this explanation something dissimilar is obtained by copying or repeating the identical document two or more times. What is said of the Fathers, that their quotations of the words of Jesus differ though they profess to cite the gospels, is not to the point.

¹ Jahrb. für deutsche Theol., 1864; Das Markus-Evangelium und seine syn. Parallelen, 1873; Das Matthaëus-Evangelium, 1876; Lehrb. der Einleit. in das N. T., 1873.

There is a great difference between giving the sense of an author and giving his very words. Now the Evangelists profess to give the words of Jesus faithfully, and in spite of this they do not adhere faithfully to the written sources in which alone his speeches are literally recorded. If an arbitrary manipulation of the sources on the part of the Evangelists may be admitted, it does not appear why we should have recourse to lost written documents rather than to the gospel of St. Matthew which St. Mark and St. Luke might have equally well differentiated into our second and third gospels.

Neither the theory of mutual-dependence, nor that of written common sources, nor finally both combined are sufficient to solve the Synoptic Problem satisfactorily; we must next examine whether the theory of a primitive oral tradition will show us the way out of the difficulty. In order to understand this hypothesis clearly, we shall first call to mind a few facts:

1. The Apostles did not merely preach Christ crucified to the multitudes, but they also instructed the neophytes in the truths of their new religion. Cf. Acts. 2. 14. ff.; 3, 12. ff.; 10, 34. ff.; 13, 15. ff.; 17, 22. ff.; 26, 2. ff.; Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 39.¹ St. Iren. *ad Florin. fragm.*² Hence we are justified in assuming the existence of certain catechetical formularies, differing according to the character of the Apostolic catechists. And this the more, since experience teaches us that in repeatedly imparting the same matter to others, we are naturally inclined to follow the same plan and to use the same expressions.

2. The Apostles could not propose Christ's doctrine indiscriminately to the neophytes; they had to select such portions as would be easily understood by their simple and rude disciples, men of nearly the same class that Jesus himself had instructed in Galilee. The Galilean ministry of Jesus was

¹ Migne 20, 300.

² Migne 7, 1288; cf. Euseb. *H. E. V.* 20. M. 20 485.

therefore a peculiarly fit basis for the Apostolic catechism. See Cor. 3, 11. cf. 11, 23; 15, 3. Besides these truths, the history of the suffering, death and resurrection must be known by all Christians. If the synoptic gospels are assumed to contain these Apostolic catechisms, the fact of their reporting only the Galilean ministry together with the closing scenes of Jesus's earthly life is satisfactorily explained.

3. The catechetical instructions of the Apostles could not be the same everywhere, but had to be adapted to places and circumstances. In Jerusalem where there were only Jewish Christians to be instructed, it was of the highest importance to prove the Messiasship of Jesus, by showing that all the Old Testament prophecies had been fulfilled in him. In Rome where most of the converts were Gentiles, not acquainted with the Old Testament, it was necessary to show that Jesus was truly God as well as man. At Antioch the converts were partly Jews partly Gentiles, so that the peace of the nascent Church required above all an explanation of the all-embracing character of the Christian dispensation. If we suppose that the synoptic gospels contain the Apostolic catechisms, their several peculiarities are again most satisfactorily explained: the gospel of St. Matthew is the catechism used in Jerusalem, the gospel of St. Luke preserves the catechetical summary taught at Antioch, while that of St. Mark was the earliest Roman catechism. We need not insist on the fact that tradition is in the strictest harmony with these results of our hypothesis.

4. Before their dispersion among the Gentiles the Apostles had for a while lived together at Jerusalem, where they no doubt, at least tacitly, agreed upon the main facts and doctrines which were to form the basis of the catechetical instruction of the neophytes. Though St. Paul was temporarily associated with the other Apostles, and especially with St. Peter, still he had been instructed apart from the rest by Jesus Christ himself, so that it would be a matter for astonishment if his catechism did not differ at least in its manner,

from that of the other Apostles. The gospel of St. Luke, the traditional catechism of St. Paul, differs in precisely such a manner from the first and second gospels, the catechisms of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

5. Though we cannot and do not maintain that the Apostles repeated their catechetical instructions in the identical words, still the Rabbinic way of teaching leads us to suppose that their formularies were practically stereotyped. This assumption becomes much more probable, if we consider that the Apostles had but a limited Greek vocabulary at their command, and were not skilled in forming phrases and sentences. Cf. *Recognit. Clement.* 2, 1; *Migne* 1, 1249; *Acts.* 10, 10. ff.; 11, 5. ff.; 9, 2. ff.; 22, 5. ff.; 26, 12. ff. The lingual peculiarities of our synoptic gospels agree admirably with these characteristics of the Apostolic instructions.

Without pretending to have successfully removed all difficulties, we confidently maintain that the Synoptic Problem is more satisfactorily solved by the third, than by either the first or second hypothesis. We are sustained in this opinion by such men as Herder, Gieseler, Ebrard, Lange, Kalchreuter, Wichelhaus, Schaff, Westcott, Le Camus, Corneli and Godet. While we gratefully acknowledge the services which have been rendered to the analysis of our synoptic gospels by the patrons of the Mutual-dependence and the Document-theories, we hope that the efforts of all the New Testament students may soon be concentrated on the development and explanation of the Tradition-hypothesis.

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

III.

THE NATURAL SCIENCES.

(Continued.)

IN our last paper we have endeavored to point out some of the principal advantages which a priest cannot fail to derive from the cultivation of the Natural Sciences. Many of these advantages are so obvious that they needed only to be recalled; to others we shall have to refer more at length later on. But there is one consideration which, from now, we desire to submit to our clerical readers. It is this—that by taking a lively and active interest in the study of nature, the Catholic priesthood of to-day will be only continuing one of the most constant as well as the most honorable traditions of its past.

The share of the Catholic Church through her clergy and her religious orders, in preserving and propagating various other forms of knowledge is generally recognized by all those who have studied, even superficially the history of civilization. But her active interest and helpfulness in the advancement of the Natural Sciences is less known. The common belief of ignorant or half-educated protestants in this country seems to be that, in some mysterious way, modern science is destructive of Catholic belief, and that the Church, with the instinct of self-preservation, keeps it back as much as possible from her children, or allows it to reach them only stunted and distorted. It has been seriously asked of the present writer, by a protestant who considered himself enlightened, what sort of science could be taught in a Catholic University! Such silly conceptions, it is true, are met with only outside the Church, but how often her children, and even her priests, remain unacquainted with all that is due to her of that science of which the

present age is so justly proud! We may be permitted to recall something of it briefly in the following pages.

I.

The history of the Natural Sciences is mainly confined to the two or three last centuries. Yet the questionings of mind in presence of the visible world are as old as man himself. They give its earliest form to Greek philosophy, and we meet them repeatedly in the Bible. But the answer to them was slow to come, and when heard, it proved in many ways unreliable,—a medley of facts and fancies,—conjectures built upon as solid realities, and authority or abstract principle doing duty for the slower but only sure method of observation and induction. Still, notwithstanding the imperfection of their methods, the ancients had accumulated a vast collection of data, and deduced from them laws and principles which the subsequent advances of science have left untouched. The mechanics of Archimedes, so far as it goes, is not different from ours. The theorems of Euclid are the foundation of our geometry. The aphorisms of Hippocrates are still quoted by our physicians. Ptolemy is reverently looked back to by astronomers, Dioscorides by botanists, Pliny by naturalists, whilst Aristotle remains the wonder of all times, by the variety, the sagacity, the originality of his observations in the realm of visible nature no less than in the higher regions of thought.

History tells us how this great scientific movement, essentially Greek in its origin and spirit, was arrested in its development by a series of political changes, principally by the Roman conquest and how it utterly disappeared amidst the confusion and accumulated ruins of the barbarian invasions.

But history tells us too where what remained of science found a refuge; how the Church like the ark of old on the waters of the deluge gathered up and preserved for future ages the living thoughts of the past. For, although her

mind was turned to the things of the unseen world more than to those of nature, yet scientific truth of all kinds never ceased to be attractive to her. Thus we find it eagerly sought for and constantly imparted in monastery and cathedral schools all through the middle ages. This is freely admitted by Hallam, and by other protestant historians. In his history of the Inductive Sciences, Dr. Whewell quotes approvingly the remarks of Montuscla: "It is impossible not to reflect that all those men, who, if they did not augment the treasure of the sciences, at least served to transmit it, were monks, or had been so originally. Convents were, during these stormy ages, the asylum of science and letters. Without these religious men, who in the silence of their monastery, occupied themselves in transcribing, in studying, in imitating the works of the ancients, well or ill, those works would have perished; perhaps not one of them would have come down to us. The thread which connects us with the Greeks and the Romans would have been snapped asunder; the precious productions of ancient literature would no more exist for us; in the sciences we should have had all to create; and at the moment the human mind should have emerged from its torpor and shaken off its slumbers, we should have been no more advanced than the Greeks were after the taking of Troy."¹

Dr. Whewell adds "It was natural that men who lived a life of quiet and study, and were necessarily in a great measure removed from the absorbing and blinding interests with which practical life occupies the thoughts, should cultivate science more successfully than others, precisely because their ideas on speculative subjects, had time and opportunity to become clear and steady."

Thus, then, an elementary knowledge of the sciences was, even in these times, for monk and cleric, not the exception, but the rule. Of the seven liberal arts, four were distinctly scientific: music, arithmetic, geometry and astronomy; and

¹ Whewell; *Hist. of induct. Sciences*, B. iv. c. 1.

Rabanus Maurus, in the ninth century, sets them all down as an integral part of the clerical programme.¹

In the works of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, from S. Augustine down to the 13th century, the reader is constantly lighting on short treatises, embodying the elements of one or other of the natural sciences. S. Isidore of Seville (7th cent.) wrote a whole Encyclopedia, summing up what could be gathered from the ancients on all manner of subjects. The same feat was repeated in the 13th century by the Dominican, Vincent de Beauvais, in his colossal *speculum*, one of its four sections being entirely devoted to natural science.

Meanwhile the works of Aristotle, almost unknown in the Latin Church for several centuries, came again to light, and awakened universal enthusiasm. Not only his metaphysical and moral writings, but his treatises on Natural Science were eagerly studied. From that date, instead of the short elementary writings of the previous period, we have before us the large tomes containing the elaborate attempts of the schoolmen to solve the mysteries of Nature. Two folios of Albertus Magnus, the teacher of S. Thomas, are devoted to problems of all kinds such as are handled by the scientists of to-day. S. Thomas himself wrote abundant commentaries on the Physics of Aristotle and constantly refers to his principles, even when dealing with theological subjects, in order, as it were, to teach all succeeding ages that the science of the unseen in its highest forms, can ill dispense with a knowledge of the facts and laws of the visible world.

During the Middle Ages, it is true, natural science was little, if at all, progressive. Mental activity flowed in other channels, and Bacon and Descartes had not yet appeared to reveal the true methods of scientific investigation. But whatever anticipation of them is to be found in that period belongs almost exclusively to the Catholic Clergy. It is a remarkable fact that of the three men who stand out in bold

¹ De Institutione Clericorum, C. 18 et seq.

relief, in mediæval times, and are honored to-day as the great precursors of modern science, one was a pope, another a cardinal, and the third a Franciscan friar. Before he was raised to the chair of Peter, under the name of Sylvester II. (999), Gerbert, the Benedictine monk, was the wonder of his age. Having assimilated all the knowledge he could find in France his native country, he visited the Arabs of Spain, then at the zenith of their power and of their proficiency in natural science, studied at their schools and, on his return enriched the age with his inventions and discoveries.

Nicholas, Cardinal de Cusa, Oriental scholar, theologian, statesman, was at the same time the most original physicist of his day. As for Roger Bacon, it is enough to say that, by the universality of his knowledge, the boldness of his speculations, the novelty and truth of his methods of investigation, the monk of the 13th century stands, in the eyes of many of our contemporary scientists, on almost as high a level as his great namesake of the Elizabethan age.

II.

The mention of Francis Bacon brings us to the last, and, beyond comparison the most brilliant period of human investigation and discovery. It is true that from the Renaissance down, the clergy cease to hold the monopoly of learning. Many of the new sciences naturally fall into the hands of professional men, such as physicians, chemists, engineers and the like. But the clergy remains a stranger to none. The names of distinguished priests may be constantly met among the great inventors and discoverers of the modern scientific era.

Thus, the father of modern astronomy, Copernicus, was canon of the Cathedral of Frauenburg, who divided his hours between prayer, works of charity, and scientific research. Gassendi, another canon, was one of the greatest astronomers and mathematicians of the 17th century. Indeed astronomy has had a sort of natural attraction for

clerics, at all times, and it may be remarked that from Copernicus down to the celebrated Jesuit astronomer and general scientist of our day, F. Secchi, at no time was that noble and elevating science without some eminent representatives among the clergy. Abbé Picard, to whose labors Newton was so deeply indebted, was the first president of the French "Academie des Sciences." He taught Astronomy in the famous "College de France," and had for many years a preponderant share in the practical work carried out in connection with his favorite science. Later on, its most conspicuous representative in France was Abbé Lacaille, whose charts and catalogues of the northern and southern skies were considered one of the noblest astronomical achievements of the 18th century. The most popular professor of Physics of that same period was again a clergyman, Abbé Mollet. So later on was Hany, the greatest mineralogist of his day, and the creator, it may be said, of the new science of Crystallography, upon which Mineralogy, since then, has mainly rested. To the Clergy, again, Italy is indebted for one of her greatest Naturalists. Spallanzani; whilst France, at the same time had reason to be proud of the celebrated discoverer and physicist, Abbé Mariotte.

These are only individual instances. To form an adequate conception of the important share taken by the Clergy in the advancement of the sciences during the last three centuries, one must take up a detailed history of each of them. Scarcely one could be named that is not under obligation to the clerical body for some valuable addition, whilst to many they continued long to be the principal contributors.

This is especially true of Geography, Ethnology, and Natural History in its various departments. To these sciences, essentially dependent on observations made directly in every part of the world, the missionaries of the 17th and 18th centuries rendered invaluable services. They were all men of education, a large number of them men of exceptional culture. Whilst their hearts were set on the

salvation of souls, their trained senses were constantly open to the strange aspects and objects of nature in the unknown regions to which they carried the Gospel, and from every part of the world hitherto unexplored, they supplied the various centres of civilization with facts carefully observed, with maps, descriptions, specimens of the fauna and flora of each country. They were the regular and most valued correspondents of the learned societies of Europe. Among the latter, the French academy of Sciences, owed them sometimes more than it cared to acknowledge. Itself, the highest among the learned bodies of the period, it always reckoned ecclesiastics among its prominent members. Its first president, Picard, was a priest; its first perpetual secretary, "the modest and learned" Abbé Duhamel, as he is styled by the recent historian of the academy, was also a cleric. Priests we find among those selected for every scientific expedition of the century, as F. Perry, S. J., has been more than once in our own times by the British Government. The same remark may be made of the learned bodies of the other catholic countries of Europe. Some of their most prominent members were invariably recruited among the religious orders or the leisured members of the secular clergy.

The lively interest and active share taken by the clergy, secular and regular, in the advancement of the Sciences has been recently brought to light in an unexpected way, by the published correspondence of the great scientists of the past, Galileo, Descartes, Leibnitz, and others. It becomes clear that none watched more eagerly than their clerical friends the fruitful labors of these great men, or were more ready to help them. Galileo, for instance, was in constant relation with the Jesuits in charge of the Roman Observatory. Between Descartes and F. Mersenne, his school-mate and fast friend—considered by many as the founder of acoustics—there was an unbroken exchange of observations and views indicative of a genuine feeling of intellectual brotherhood be-

tween them. As for Leibnitz, it has been long known that—much—not to say most—of his scientific correspondence was exchanged with religious, or with secular clergymen.

The history of the religious orders strongly emphasizes the same conclusion. Ever conspicuous in their zeal for the advancement of learning, they have all had a share in the conquests of modern science. The Society of Jesus in particular presents a magnificent record. Even if the Catholic Church had nothing to show in the investigation of nature, for the last three centuries, beyond the labors of this great Society, she might still be proud of her work. Whilst the Dominicans, the Benedictines, the Oratorians and other religious bodies resuscitated the past in those works of wide erudition and marvellous critical skill, to which each succeeding generation of scholars pays fresh and unstinted homage, the Society of Jesus devoted itself in a special manner to that form of knowledge which was to captivate the thoughts and energies of the future. From the very inception of the Order, Mathematics took their place side by side with Philosophy and Theology. In the Roman College, whose undiminished fame, for better than two hundred years, was entirely due to the Society, the University emblem represented Theology as assisted by Mathematics on one side and Physics on the other. Mathematical Astronomy seems to have been one of their favorite pursuits. There were few colleges of the Jesuits, says Montuscla, in Germany and the neighboring countries, which had not an observatory. Not long before the suppression of the order, a number of Jesuits were engaged in the direction of Observatories at Wurtzburg, Vienna, Florence, Venice, etc. In the Museum of Georgetown College may be still seen the gold medal, struck by order of the king of Sweden to commemorate F. de Vico's discovery of six comets. On setting out for the Chinese Empire, the Jesuit Missionaries were frequently honored with the fellowship of the French Academy of Sciences, and continued the interesting series

of their scientific reports, whilst they enjoyed the dignity of high Mandarins in the Celestial Empire.

We must confine ourselves here to this bare outline. A whole volume would be needed to do full justice to the subject. But enough has been said to dispose of the notion, so sedulously propagated among our contemporaries, that the representatives of Christianity have been always unfriendly to science, and that if the modern mind has made such gigantic strides in the Knowledge of Nature, it is because it has escaped from the thralldom of ecclesiastical authority and priestly dictation. That religious men may have occasionally taken too narrow a view of christian doctrine and been unduly alarmed at the claims of science, we readily allow. But we would observe first, that the remark, in so far as it is true, applies much more to protestant than to catholic Theologians ;—secondly, that no interference of the Catholic Church can be pointed out which has, at any time, sensibly impeded or stayed the advancement of Science. Even the celebrated case of Galileo, if viewed fairly, will prove no exception to the rule.

If, during the present century, the Catholic clergy has not taken so active a share in the study of Nature as in the past, the reason must be sought for in the political and social changes which, at the close of the last century, originated in France, and from there extended to the rest of Europe. After the great storm had subsided, the French clergy reappeared, diminished in numbers, despoiled of its principal resources, with a vast population still Catholic and craving for the essential helps of Catholic life. What could priests do but rush to their assistance, and relinquish all thought of higher culture in their devotion to such pressing needs?

Now this condition of things has remained substantially unaltered down to the present day. At no time during the present century has the French clergy had a leisured class, as in the past, free to devote itself to scientific research, and this

is still more obviously true of the Catholic clergy in the United States, and indeed in all English-speaking countries. In others, such as Italy, Germany and Spain, less deeply disturbed by the great Revolution, there may have been more room for such studies : but others having a closer connection with religion were naturally preferred. Yet it would be a great mistake to suppose that anywhere the Clergy have become strangers to natural science. At the present day there is scarcely a country in which distinguished representatives of that form of Knowledge may not be found among the Clergy, secular and regular. Their number is fast increasing, even in this country, where so few can find time for such pursuits. The new Faculty of Philosophy soon to be inaugurated in the Catholic University of Washington will doubtless give a fresh and powerful impetus in the same direction. The whole body of the Clergy is becoming more keenly alive to the fact that, if knowledge is power, the knowledge of nature is preëminently so, and that it would be a fatal mistake to leave it all in the hands of enemy or stranger.

J. HOGAN.

LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS ON ART.

VII.

TRANSIENT EMOTIONS.

PERMANENT characteristics express themselves in the shape and form of the face. Nature herself gives us a certain measure whereby to determine the proximate dimensions of those qualities which in themselves are intangible and immaterial or at least hidden to the outward senses.¹

There are other characteristics of the countenance, which are transient. These are nearly alike in all persons, but owing to the difference of each individual face affect the features in different ways. It is quite true that if the causes which produce these changes, although ordinarily transient, were to become habitual, they would in the end leave their permanent impression upon the face. Thus we see persons who seem forever to smile; others who appear constantly sad, although they may not be conscious that anything pleases or grieves them. Whilst the permanent features implying separate characteristics in man are on the one hand indicated by the native formation and position of the bones and the construction of the sense organs—the

¹ Quite recently a book has been published in France by one of the heads of the prefecture of police, which is likely to attract the attention not only of those whose special object it must be to observe human nature, but of artists also. It has been for years the practice of the police officials to preserve photographic copies of certain classes of criminals in order to identify them in case of repetitions of the same misdemeanors. Practically the matter of identification proved a difficult task, when for example a certain photograph was to be selected, say out of a number of 90,000, in order to make the comparison. Deception arising out of the confusion of looking over so many faces was easy. Mr. Bertillon therefore devised a new plan of identification by which the photographs could be classified. He measured the length of certain portions of the face, head, etc., thus reducing the observation of physiological differences to a mathematical science.—The title of the book is: *La Photographie judiciaire, par Alphonse Bertillon, chef du service d'identification de la préfecture de police.*—Paris, Gauthier-Villars, 1890.

transient emotions are produced by the play of those muscles which I have described in a former letter. If this muscular activity becomes habitual it leaves as has been said its stamp in a more or less pronounced and permanent form upon the countenance.

Let us take the principal emotions to which most men are subject and see how they affect the muscles of the face. As the feeling of joy comes into the soul the corners of the mouth are slightly raised. This is one of the first marks. By this unconscious action of the levers on each side of the mouth the circular muscle-band which surrounds the lips is relaxed and forthwith the mouth slightly opens. The fleshy portion of the cheek, being thus raised, gathers into folds and moves the entire surface of the cheek upwards, forming numerous lines below the eyelids and giving to the eye the appearance of being slightly closed. In proportion as the joy heightens and turns the smile into laughter, these effects become more pronounced. Witness the raising of the corners forcing the mouth wider open, which draws the nostrils upward; the eyes nearly close in their wrinkled beds which press upon the glands above so as to force tears from them, as in cases of excessive mirth. As regards the fashioning of the folds around mouth, nose and eyes, the general law holds good that in joy they rise into rounded lines strongly marked; and some gather radiating in every direction from an orb. Notice that this emotion of joy begins so to speak, at the mouth and continues upward. It has its source in the affections or the heart and thence acts upon the mind.

The opposite emotion of anger begins apparently at the forehead as though it were more closely allied to pride of intellect than to feeling or sense. The first warning of rising anger is a contraction of the eyebrows, lowering where they approach the root of the nose and forming decided furrows immediately above it. This contraction has the effect of producing irregular folds upon the forehead, something in the shape of a cross, to which the perceptible swell-

ing of the frontal veins gives a peculiar emphasis. There are no wrinkles in this case below the eyes, but the projecting eyebrows impart a sort of darkening shadow above the eye. For the rest, the lines of the face which were rounded in mirth, become rigid now. The nostrils are distended and the lips compressed. Whilst in joy and laughter the head more frequently inclines forward, it is raised in anger or any kindred motion of pride.

Another emotion, opposed to joy, is sorrow. It shows itself distinctly and at one and the same moment in both mouth and forehead. In it the lips are drawn down at the corners, whereas in joy they were raised. Owing to this motion of the lips the facial surface lying between the eyes and the mouth appear lengthened, whilst the merry laugh seemed to shorten that part. The eyebrows are contracted, not however as in anger, downward to the nose, but rising, as they meet each other, toward the centre of the forehead. The lower eyelids are drawn toward the angle formed by the eye and nose, and the eyelids droop. The position of the head is generally forward and, strange to say, bent to one side. The contraction of the muscles around the eyes has, in proportion as it becomes more violent, the effect of touching the tear glands so as to produce weeping. This occurs even when the emotion is inwardly checked by the action of the will. The muscles of the mouth first relax and draw the face downward, whilst the counteraction of the muscles around the eye increases the tension bearing upon the cheek, and gives to the afflicted face the long and languid expression. In silent sorrow the lips are parted from a sense of abandonment. For the rest, the lines of the face in sorrow are not straight but rounded, although the curves are in a direction just opposite to those which we mark in the emotion of joy.

Different from the above expressions is that induced by the sense of fear. The effect of this emotion may be best characterized by saying that it throws open all the organs.

The lines of the face are more or less straight. Thus the lips are parted remaining in an almost horizontal position without any inclination at the corners. The eye is wide open, showing the white of the eyeball above the iris. The eyebrows seem lifted, but without change from their normal direction. The nostrils are distended. All the above symptoms intensify in proportion as fear turns into terror. The head is thrown back but in a rigid fashion unlike that of pride which preserves a turn denoting conscious action.

Much more could of course be said in regard to the manifestations of various other emotions; but I believe that in these four just mentioned, you have the main features of all the sensations which in a marked and distinct way affect the expression of the face. The others are more or less modifications and blendings of these principal emotions. It may be safe to say that in all cases the angle of the mouth and the inner extremity of the eyebrows give you the key to the expression of the different internal sensations. If you carefully observe the action of these which are as it were the cardinal points of facial expression you will soon become accustomed to copy the feelings of others upon your canvas. Certainly there are other items of considerable importance, which however you can hardly fail to catch in connection with the above-mentioned. For example, the position of the head varies with almost every distinct emotion in some characteristic way. Sometimes too the change of features affects one side of the face differently from the other. The expression of contempt, produced by a mingling of satisfaction (moderate joy,) and anger, causes not only the head to turn aside from the object of disdain, but one side of the upper lip is raised in oblique fashion toward the same object.

COLORING.

In the matter of coloring you have your masters who are guided more by experience or by experimenting, than by any definite rules. Nevertheless for the sake of completeness let me give you a few hints.

Flesh tints can of course be produced in a hundred ways. The complexion of a face is suggested not only by the temperament, race, or individual character of a person, but also by its surroundings either expressed in the picture itself or at least indicated and supposed. The style of a picture often determines what is called the key-note of its coloring, that is to say some tint which, pervading all the different pigments, harmonizes them as under a common light.

I believe it is customary in oil painting to draw the outline of a picture with brown madder. Next the background ought to be determined. This is important, for, unless you know from habit the real effect of your flesh tints, the eye is apt to be deceived in its judgment of the light. After having indicated the background you wash the entire face, except the eyes, with a light coat of Venetian red, or, as is more common, with pink madder mixed with transparent yellow or yellow ochre. Next you paint or "blot in," as painters say, the darker shades beneath the eyebrows, eyes, nose, and chin. The incisions of the nostrils and lips are usually made with pink and brown madder. For the shadows painters use Indian red and blue, usually cobalt. Indian red and lake produces a warm shade, which is deepened by ivory black and white. Some use burnt Siena with ultramarine for the half lights. Of course experiment is the great teacher of what exact effects are produced by certain mixtures of color.

The blending of colors in the more open portions of the face ought, it seems to me, be done whilst the paint is still moist. The same may be said of the drawing of the arteries and folds or furrows, although some artists manage to produce exquisite work with transparent colors when the picture is dry. A beautiful effect of vivid flesh coloring is brought about by tracing delicate lines with vermillion, like the irregular branchlets of veins over the forehead, temples, nose, cheek, and chin. This has to be done very deftly and judiciously. I think it is only done in portraits of men, as it

deprives the texture of that softness peculiar to the female complexion. For the lips vermillion and pink madder seem to serve every purpose.

TITULARS IN AUGUST.

I. ST. PETER'S CHAINS (AUGUST 1st).

Aug. 1. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. quæ commemor. sing. dieb. et 8. Aug. fit de die Octava. SS. Cyr. et Smaragd. figend. 9. Aug. et *pro Clero Romano* 7. Sept.

II. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGORIO (AUGUST 2d).

Aug. 2. Dupl. 1. cl. Com. Dom. Fit com. Oct. singul. dieb. et 9. Aug. fit de die Octava ex qua *pro Clero Romano* movend. S. Emigd. in 7. Sept.

III. ST. DOMINIC (AUGUST 4th).

Aug. 4. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. cujus fit com. quotidie except. 10. Aug. et fit 11. Aug. de die Octava ex qua *pro Clero Romano* figend. S. Xystus 7. Sept.

IV. FEAST OF THE TRANSFIGURATION (AUGUST 6th).

Aug. 6. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. quæ commemor. except. 10. Aug. et cujus Octava celebrat. 13. Aug. unde ulterius *pro Clero Romano* figend. S. Vinc. a Paulo 7. Sept.

V. ST. LAWRENCE (AUGUST 10th).

Aug. 10. Dupl. 1. cl. Reliqua ut in Calend.

VI. ST. PHILOMENA (AUGUST 11th).

(See Eccl. Rev. 1890).

Aug. 11. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 13. et 14. Aug. et ejus com. ante S. Laur. except. 15. et 16. Aug. ex die Octava *pro Clero Romano* ulterius figend. S. Hyacinth 7. Sept.

VII. ST. CLARE (AUGUST 12th).

Aug. 12, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 13. et 14. Aug. et quæ commemorat. post oct. Assumpt. except. 15. et 16. Aug. *Pro Clero Romano*, ex die Octava movend. S. Urban in 7. Sept.

VIII. ASSUMPTION OF THE B. V. MARY (AUGUST 15).

This is the Titular of all the feasts of the B. V. that have no special day in the Calendar.

Aug. 15, Ut in Calend. per totam Octavam.

IX. ST. HYACINTH (AUGUST 16).

Aug. 16. Dupl. 1. cl. com. Dom. Oct. commemor. post Oct. B. M. V. except. 18. August. in quam transferend. S. Joachim pro utroq. Clero. Ex die Octava perpet. transferend. S. Philip. in 26. Aug. et *pro Clero Romano*. Fest. Puris. Cordis hoc anno omittitur.

X. ST. JOACHIM (AUGUST 16).

Aug. 16. Dupl. 1. cl. com. Dom. Octavæ fit com. post Oct. Assumpt. In die Octava de S. Philip. fit ut simplex et *pro Clero Romano*. Fest. Puriss. Cord. hoc anno omittitur.

XI. ST. HELEN (AUGUST 18). "

Aug. 18. Dupl. 1. cl. *Pro Clero Romano* ulterius movend. S. Hyac. in 7. Sept. et S. Bartholom. celebrand. 24. Aug. com. Oct. quotid. except. 24. Aug. Ex die Octava figend. S. Ludov. die sequente.

XII. ST. BERNARD (AUGUST 20).

Aug. 20. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 26. Aug. et quæ ceteris dieb. commemor. except. 24. Aug. De die Octava unde movend. S. Joseph in 1. Sept. fit 27. Aug. *Pro Clero Romano* idem nisi quod tant. com. Oct. per omn. dies except. 25. Aug. et quod movend. S. Jos. in 7. Sept.

XIII. SACRED HEART OF MARY (AUGUST 23).

Only for churches following the Roman Ordo. (See Eccl. Rev. 1890).

Aug. 23. Dupl. 1. cl. com. Dom. Com. Oct. quotid. except. 25. Aug. in die Octava de S. Rosa fit ut simplex.

XIV. ST. BARTHOLOMEW (AUGUST 24).

Aug. 24. (etiam pro Clero Rom. extra urbem) Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit in calend. communi, 27. Aug. et aliter commemorat. *Pro Clero Romano* ponitur S. Ludov. 25. Aug. Ex die Octava movendus S. Raym. in diem seq. et *Pro Clero Romano* in 7. Sept.

XV. ST. LOUIS (AUGUST 25).

Aug. 25. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 26. Aug. et aliter commemor. *Pro Clero Romano* celebr. S. Barthol. 24. Aug. et ex die Octava ulterius figend. S. Elizab. 7. Sept.

XVI. ST. AUGUSTINE (AUGUST 28).

Aug. 28. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 1. et 3. Sept. et aliter commemor. De die Octava fit 4. Sept. unde *pro Clero Romano* movenda S. Rosa in 7. Sept.

XVII. ST. ROSA OF LIMA (AUGUST 30).

Aug. 30 Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 1, 3, et 4. Sept. et reliq. dieb. commemor. De die Octava fit 6. Sept. cum com. Dom. *Pro Clero Romano* hinc movend. Commemor. Summor. Pontif. in 27. Sept.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

The Clause "Injuncta Eleemosyna" in our Faculties
(Form D and E).

In the matrimonial dispensations as they have been granted by the S. Pœnitentiaria, ever since the beginning of the present century *pro foro utroque*, i. e. also *pro foro externo*; the clause "injuncta aliqua eleemosyna arbitrio Ordinarii eroganda" or a similar phrase is usually added. As to the obligatory force of this clause, the S. Pœnitentiaria had declared (in a letter addressed to the Vicar-general of Bourges, dated June 11, 1859), that it was not necessary that the injunction should be complied with before the dispensation could be granted, but that it was sufficient, if the petitioners had promised to give the alms. From this decision the inference appeared legitimate that the clause did not in any way affect the validity of the dispensation. Nevertheless there were canonists who maintained that the wording of the clause (being in the ablative absolute) did imply that the dispensation obtained had no validity in case the injunction were not literally fulfilled. (Cf. Feije de imped. ed. III, n. 745, pag. 758, and others). The same interpretation was given to the clause as found in the faculties granted to our Bishops. (Konings. Comment. in facult. n. 185). This gave rise occasionally to serious difficulties not only in the case of very poor persons who require the marriage dispensation, but also with those who were either ill-disposed towards the Church or wished to contract a mixed marriage. By a decision of the S. Pœnitentiaria, dated Nov. 11, 1890 the question has at length been definitely settled, so as to render the said clause "non de valore," leaving it in particular cases to the discretion and decision of the Ordinary.

J. P.

*Circa eleemosynam pauperibus injunctam in rescriptis
Dispensationum matrimonialium.*

BEATISSIME PATER,

Vicarius generalis, officialis diœcesis N. . . . , humiliter exponit, quæ sequuntur :

In rescriptis dispensationum matrimonialium pro utroque foro favore pauperum, Sacra Pœnitentiaria clausulam inserit : “Erogata ab eis aliqua eleemosyna arbitrio Ordinarii juxta eorum vires taxanda et applicanda.” Jamvero Orator aliquoties, ob extremam paupertatem contrahentium, eorumve malam voluntatem, clausulam præterire satius duxit, et de eleemosyna omnino siluit. Nunc autem dubius et anceps quærit :

1. Utrum nulliter dispensationes fulminaverit ? Et quatenus affirmative, instanter supplicat pro sanatione in radice.

Quatenus autem negative,

2. Utrum in eadem praxi perseverare possit, saltem in casibus valde arduis ?

Et Deus . . etc.

Sacra Pœnitentiaria Dilecto in Christo Ordinario N scribenti respondet :

Ad I. *Negative.*

Ad II. *Rem prudenti judicio et conscientiæ Ordinarii remitti.*

Datum Romæ in Sacra Pœnitentiaria die 11 Novembri 1890.

F. SEGNA, S. P. R.

R. CELLI, S. P. Substus.

ANALECTA.

DECRETA S SEDIS RECENTIA QUOAD MATRIMONIUM.

We propose to publish under this head in successive numbers of the present volume (Fifth) of the *Review* the different decrees relative to matrimonial Dispensations issued by the present Sovereign Pontiff in answer to various "Postulata" of Bishops since the Vatican Council, whereby a new *Jus*, if we may say so, has been created affecting the practical judgment in matters of Moral Theology. A few of these Decrees are already known and may be found in the Appendix to the Decreta of the Third Baltimore Council. Nevertheless it will be deemed an advantage especially by students of theology, to have the whole matter thus brought together in one volume, the more so as some of the decisions receive their full interpretation only by the subsequent answers to *dubia* raised by the application of previous decrees. The answer of the Cardinal Prefect together with the decision of the S. Office in regard to the application of the "Declaratio Benedictina" in the United States will receive separate treatment in order to call attention to an error made current by several of our Theological periodicals, as if the said Declaration had not been promulgated in the Province of Santa Fé.

EX S. CONG. S. R. U. INQUISITIONIS.

I.

Litteræ ad Ordinarios locorum quoad dispensationes matrimoniales.¹

ILLME AC REVME DOMINE:

De mandato Sanctissimi D. N. Leonis XIII Supremæ Congregationi S. Rom. et Univ. Inquisitionis nuperrimis temporibus duplex quæstionum genus expendendum propositum fuit. Primum respicit facultates, quibus urgente mortis periculo, quando tempus non suppetit recurrendi ad S. Sedem, augere conveniat locorum Ordinarios dispensandi super impedimentis publicis matrimonium dirimentibus cum iis, qui juxta civiles leges sunt conjuncti aut alias in concubinato vivunt, et morituri in tanta temporis angustia in faciem Ecclesiæ rite copulari, et propriæ conscientiæ consulere valeant: alterum spectat ad executionem dispensationum, quæ ab Apostolica Sede impertiri solent.

¹ Act. S. Sedis. Vol. xx. 543.

Ad primum quod attinet, re serio diligenterque perpensa, approbatoque et confirmato Eminentissimorum Patrum una necum Generalium Inquisitorum suffragio, Sanctitas Sua benigne annuit pro gratia, qua locorum Ordinarii dispensare valeant sive per se, sive per ecclesiasticam personam, sibi benevisam, ægrotos in gravissimo mortis periculo constitutos, quando non suppetit tempus recurrendi ad S. Sedem super impedimentis quantumvis publicis matrimonium jure ecclesiastico dirimentibus, excepto sacro presbyteratus Ordine, et affinitate linæ rectæ ex copula licita proveniente.

Mens autem est ejusdem Sanctitatis Suæ, ut si quando, quod absit, necessitas ferat, ut dispensandum sit cum iis, qui sacro subdiaconatus aut diaconatus ordine sunt insigniti vel solemnem professionem religiosam emisierint, atque post dispensationem et matrimonium rite celebratum convaluerint, in extraordinariis hujusmodi casibus, Ordinarii de imperita dispensatione Supremam Sancti Officii Congregationem certiores faciant et interim omni ope curent, ut scandalum, si quod adsit, eo meliori modo quo fieri possit removeatur tum inducendo eosdem ut in loca se conferant, ubi eorum conditio ecclesiastica aut religiosa ignoratur, tum si id obtineri nequeat, injungendo saltem iisdem spiritualia exercitia aliasque salutare pœnitentias, atque eam vitæ rationem, quæ præteritis excessibus redimendis apta videatur, quæquæ fidelibus exemplo sit ad recte et christianæ vivendum.

De Altero vero quæstionum genere, item approbato et confirmato eorundem Eminentissimorum Patrum suffragio Sanctissimus sanxit:

1. Dispensationes matrimoniales omnes in posterum committendas esse vel Oratorum Ordinario vel Ordinario loci:

2. Apellatione Ordinarii, venire Episcopos, administratores seu Vicarios Apostolicos, Prælatos, seu Præfectos habentes jurisdictionem cum territorio separato, eorumque officiales seu Vicarios in Spiritualibus generales, et sede vacante Vicarium Capitularem vel legitimum Administratorem:

3. Vicarium Capitularem seu Administratorem eas quoque dispensationes Apostolicas exequi posse, quæ remissæ fuerint Episcopo aut Vicario ejus generali vel Officiali nondum executioni mandatas, sive hi illas exequi cœperint, sive non. Et vicissim, sede deinde provisa, posse Episcopum vel ejus Vicarium in spiritualibus generalem seu Officalem exequi dispensationes quæ Vicario capitulari exequendæ remissæ fuerant, seu hic illas exequi cœperit seu minus.

4. Dispensationes Matrimoniales Ordinario oratorum commissas exequendas esse ab illo Ordinario, qui litteras testimoniales dedit, vel preces transmisit ad S. Sedem Apostolicam, sive sit Ordinarius originis sine domicilii, sive utriusque sponsi, sive alterutrius eorum; etiamsi sponsi quo tempore executioni danda erit dispensatio, relicto illius diœcesis domicilio, in aliam diœcesim discesserint non amplius reversuri, monito tamen, si id expedire judicaverit, Ordinario loci, in quo matrimonium contrahitur.

5. Ordinario prædicto fas esse, si ita quoque expedire judicaverit, ad dispensationis executionem delegare alium Ordinarium, eum præsertim, in cujus diœcesi sponsi actu degunt.

Hæc quæ ad pastorale ministerium utilius faciliusque reddendum Sanctissimus Dominus Noster concedenda et statuenda judicavit, dum libens tecum communico, bona cuncta Amplitudini Tuæ precor a Domino.

Datum Romæ die 20 Februarii 1888.

RAPH. CADR. MONACO.

II.

Dubium quoad facultatem dispensandi super impedimentis publicis matrimonialibus in mortis periculo.¹

ILLME AC REVME DOMINE. "

Supremæ huic Congregationi Sancti Officii propositum fuit dubium : "Utrum Ordinarii in casibus extremæ necessitatis facultatem dispensandi super impedimentis publicis matrimonialibus in mortis periculo, literis Supremæ Congregat. die 20 Febr. 1888 concessam, parochis et universim confessariis approbatis modo generali subdelegare valeant, an non." Quo dubio mature perpenso, Eminentissimi Patres una mecum Generales Inquisitores fer. IV, die 9 Januarii 1889 dixerunt : "Supplicandum Sanctissimo ut decernere et declarare dignetur, Ordinarios, quibus memorata facultas præcitatis literis diei 20 Februarii 1888 data fuit, posse illam subdelegare habitualiter parochis tantum, sed pro casibus, in quibus desit tempus ad ipsos Ordinarios recurrendi et periculum sit in mora." Eadem feria ac die Sanctissimus D. N. D. Leo divina providentia PP. XIII, in solita audientia R. P. D. Adsectoris S. O.

¹ Act. S. Sedis Vol. xxi. p. 696.

impertita, benigne annuere dignatus est juxta Eminentissimorum PP. Suffragium.

Hæc tibi dum nota facio, fausta cuncta ac felicia precor a Dno.

Datum Romæ ex S. O. die 1 Martii 1889.

R. CARD. MONACO.

III.

De Facultate Dispensandi Urgente Mortis Periculo in Impedimentis Matrimonialibus cum Civiliter Junctis vel in Concubinato Viventibus.¹

BEATISSIME PATER.

Vicarius generalis N....., ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuæ provolutus, sequentium dubiorum solutionem perhumiliter expostulat, nempe :

Litteris S. Officii datis die 20 Februarii anno 1888, concessa est locorum Ordinariis facultas dispensandi, sive per se sive per ecclesiasticam personam sibi benevisam, ægrotos in gravissimo mortis periculo constitutos, quando non suppetit tempus recurrenti ad S. Sedem, super impedimentis quantumvis publicis matrimonium jure ecclesiastico dirimentibus, excepto sacro presbyteratus ordine et affinitate lineæ rectæ et copula licita proveniente.

Decreto vero lato fer. IV die 9 Januarii 1889 declaratum est, Ordinarios quibus memorata facultas præcitatis litteris diei 20 Februarii 1888 data fuit, posse illam subdelegare habitualiter parochis tantum, sed pro casibus in quibus desit tempus ad ipsos Ordinarios recurrenti et periculum sit in mora.

Jam igitur quæritur :

1. Utrum S. Congregatio per verba "super impedimentis quantumvis publicis" confirmare intenderit communem Theologorum et præsertim S. Alphonsi sententiam, quæ habet posse Episcopos in casibus urgentis necessitatis dispensare super impedimentis occultis, eamque facultatem veluti ordinariam probabiliter delegare etiam generaliter, ita ut mens Congregationis fuerit significare, Episcopos a fortiori ab impedimentis occultis in prædictis adjunctis dispensare posse ?

2. Utrum in gravissimo mortis periculo coadjutores parochi, quando ob ingentem parochiarum illius diocesis amplitudinem ad eum recurrere non possunt, nomine parochi ab impedimentis publicis dispensare valeant ?

¹ N.R. Th. xxii. 490.

3. Utrum in decreto die 9 Januarii 1889 nomine parochorum veniant etiam vicarii temporales qui post obitum parochorum vel in eorum absentia sufficiuntur?

FERIA IV DIE 23 APRILIS 1890.

In Congregatione Generali S. Romanæ et Universalis Inquisitionis habita per Eminentissimos ac Reverendissimos DD. Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales propositis suprascriptis dubiis, ac præhabito Reverendissimorum DD. Consultorum voto, iidem Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Patres rescribi mandarunt :

Ad I Ex vi decreti, affirmative pro mortis articulo.

Ad II et III Detur responsum hac eadem feria datum R. P. D. Abbati Sanctissimæ Trinitatis Caven., quod est sequens, scilicet :

Propositis a R. P. D. Abbate supra laudato sequentibus dubiis :

I. An sub nomine parochorum in subdelegatione facultatis, de qua in præcibus, intelligendi sunt etiam vice parochi vel œconomi curati ad nutum amovibiles, in quibus parœciis parochi stricte sumpti ac vere nominis non sunt creati? et quatenus negative.

II. Utrum saltem in diœcesibus, in quibus, sicut et in abbazia nullius Sanctissimæ Trinitatis Caven, ex privilegio vel ex antiquissima ac immemorabili consuetudine, nonnullæ sunt parœciæ, quarum curati tamquam vicarii abbatis sunt instituti sub nomine œconomi vel archipresbyteri curati, ad nutum amovibiles ad hos quoque possit extendi?

Eminentissimi Domini Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales prædicta die ac feria rescribi mandarunt :

Ad I Comprehendi omnes, qui actu curam animarum exercent, exclusis vice parochis et capellanis.

Ad II Provisum in præcedenti.

Eadem feria ac die facta de his Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papæ XIII relatione Sanctitas Sua resolutionem Eminentissimorum PP. approbavit et confirmavit.

J. MANCINI, S. R. et U. I. Not.

ANALECTA.
 SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI.
 LEONIS
 DIVINA PROVIDENTIA
 PAPAE XIII.

LITTERÆ ENCYCLICÆ

AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES ARCHIEPISCOPOS ET EPISCOPOS
 UNIVERSOS CATHOLICI ORBIS GRATIAM ET COMMUNI-
 ONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

DE CONDITIONE OPIFICUM.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS, ARCHI-
 EPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS UNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS
 GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA
 SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.
 VENERABILES FRATRES

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

RERUM novarum semel excitata cupidine, quæ diu quidem com-
 movet civitates, illud erat consecuturum ut commutationum
 studia a rationibus politicis in œconomicarum cognatum genus aliquan-
 do defluerent.—Revera nova industriæ incrementa novisque euntes
 itineribus artes: mutatæ dominorum et mercenariorum rationes mutæ:
 divitiarum in exiguo numero affluentia, in multitudine inopia: opificum
 cum de se confidentia maior, tum inter se necessitudo coniunctior,
 præterea versi in deteriora mores, effecere, ut certamen erumperet. In
 quo quanta rerum momenta vertantur, ex hoc apparet, quod animos
 habet acri expectatione suspensos: idemque ingenia exercet doctorum,
 concilia prudentum, conciones populi, legumlatorum iudicium, consilia
 principum, ut iam caussa nulla reperiatur tanta, quæ teneat hominum

studia vehementius.—Itaque, proposita Nobis Ecclesiæ caussa et salute communi, quod alias censuevimus, Venerabiles Fratres, datis ad vos Litteris de imperio politico, de libertate humana, de civitatum constitutione christiana, aliisque non dissimili genere, quæ ad refutandas opinionum fallacias opportuna videbantur, idem nunc faciendum *de conditione opificum* iisdem de causis duximus.—Genus hoc argumenti non semel iam per occasionem attigimus: in his tamen litteris totam data opera tractare quæstionem apostolici muneris conscientia monet, ut principia emineant, quorum ope, uti veritas atque æquitas postulant, dimicatio dirimatur. Causa est ad expediendum difficilis, nec vacua periculo. Arduum siquidem metiri iura et officia, quibus locupletes et proletarios, eos qui rem, et eos qui operam conferant, inter se oportet contineri. Periculosa vero contentio, quippe quæ ab hominibus turbulentis et callidis ad pervertendum iudicium veri concitandamque seditiose multitudinem passim detorquetur. Utcumque sit, plane videmus, quod consentiunt universi, infimæ sortis hominibus celeriter esse atque opportune consulendum, cum pars maxima in misera calamitosaque fortuna indigne versentur. Nam veteribus artificum collegiis superiore sæculo deletis, nulloque in eorum locum suffecto præsidio, cum ipsa instituta legesque publicæ avitam religionem exuissent, sensim factum est ut opifices inhumanitati dominorum effrenatæque competitorum cupiditati solitarios atque indefensos tempus tradiderit.—Malum auxit usura vorax, quæ non semel Ecclesiæ iudicio damnata, tamen ab hominibus avidis et quæstuosis per aliam speciem exercetur eadem: huc accedunt et conductio operum et rerum omnium commercia fere in paucorum redacta potestatem, ita ut opulenti ac prædivites perpauci prope servile iugum infinitæ proletariorum multitudini imposuerint.

Ad huius sanationem mali *Socialistæ* quidem, sollicitata egentium in locupletes invidia, evertere privatas bonorum possessiones contendunt oportere, earumque loco communia universis singulorum bona facere, procurantibus viris qui aut municipio præsint, aut totam rempublicam gerant. Eiusmodi translatione bonorum a privatis ad commune, mederi se posse præsentī malo arbitrantur, res et commoda inter cives æqualiter partiendo. Sed est adeo eorum ratio ad contentionem dirimendam inepta, ut ipsum opificum genus afficiat incommodo: eademque præterea est valde injusta, quia vim possessoribus legitimis affert, pervertit officia reipublicæ, penitusque miscet civitates.

Sane, quod facile est pervidere, ipsius operæ, quam suscipiunt qui in

arte aliqua quæstuosa versantur, hæc per se caussa est, atque hic finis quo proxime spectat artifex, rem sibi quærere privatoque iure possidere uti suam ac propriam. Is enim si vires, si industriam suam alteri commodat, hanc ob caussam commodat ut res adipiscatur ad victum cultumque necessarias: ideoque ex opera data ius verum perfectumque sibi quærit non modo exigendæ mercedis, sed et collocandæ uti velit. Ergo si tenuitate sumptuum quicquam ipse comparsit, fructumque parsimoniæ suæ quo tutior esse custodia possit, in prædio collocavit, profecto prædium istiusmodi nihil est aliud, quam merces ipsa aliam induta speciem: proptereaque cœmptus sic opifici fundus tam est in eius potestate futurus, quam parta labore merces. Sed in hoc plane, ut facile intelligitur, rerum dominium vel moventium vel solidarum consistit. In eo igitur quod bona privatorum transferre *Socialistæ* ad commune nituntur, omnium mercenariorum faciunt conditionem deteriore, quippe quos, collocandæ mercedis libertate sublata, hoc ipso augendæ rei familiaris utilitatumque sibi comparandarum spe et facultate despoliant.

Verum, quod maius est, remedium proponunt cum iustitia aperte pugnans, quia possidere res privatim ut suas, ius est homini a natura datum.—Revera hac etiam in re maxime inter hominem et genus interest animantium ceterarum. Non enim se ipsæ regunt belluæ, sed reguntur gubernanturque duplici naturæ instinctu: qui tum custodiunt expectant in eis facultatem agendi, viresque opportune evolvunt, tum etiam singulos earum motus exsuscitant iidem et determinant. Altero instinctu ad se vitamque tuendam, altero ad conservationem generis ducuntur sui. Utrumque vero commode assequuntur earum rerum usu quæ adsunt, quæque præsentis sunt: nec sane progredi longius possent, quia solo sensu moventur rebusque singularibus sensu perceptis.—Longe alia hominis natura. Inest in eo tota simul ac perfecta vis naturæ animantis, ideoque tributum ex hac parte homini est, certe non minus quam generi animantium omni, ut rerum corporearum fruatur bonis. Sed natura animans quantumvis cumulate possessa, tantum abest ut naturam circumscribat humanam, ut multo sit humana natura inferior, et ad parendum huic obediendumque nata. Quod eminet atque excelsit in nobis, quod homini tribuit ut homo sit, et a belluis differat genere toto, mens seu ratio est. Et ob hanc caussam quod solum hoc animal est rationis particeps, bona homini tribuere necesse est non utenda solum, quod est omnium animantium commune, sed stabili

perpetuoque iure possidenda, neque ea dumtaxat quæ usu consumuntur, sed etiam quæ, nobis utentibus, permanent.

Quod magis etiam apparet, si hominum in se natura altius spectetur. —Homo enim cum innumerabilia ratione comprehendat, rebusque præsentibus adiungat atque annectat futuras, cumque actionum suarum sit ipse dominus, propterea sub lege æterna, sub potestate omnia providentissime gubernantis Dei, se ipse gubernat providentia consilii sui: quamobrem in eius est potestate res eligere quas ad consulendum sibi non modo in præsens, sed etiam in reliquum tempus, maxime iudicet idoneas. Ex quo consequitur, ut in homine esse non modo terrenorum fructuum, sed ipsius terræ dominatum oporteat, quia e terræ fetu sibi res suppeditari videt ad futurum tempus necessarias. Habent cuiusque hominis necessitates velut perpetuos redditus, ita ut hodie expletæ, in crastinum nova imperent. Igitur rem quamdam debet homini natura dedisse stabilem perpetuoque mansuram, unde perennitas subsidii expectari posset. Atqui istiusmodi perennitatem nulla res præstare, nisi cum ubertatibus suis terra, potest.

Neque est, cur providentia introducatur reipublicæ: est enim homo, quam respublica, senior: quocirca ius ille suum ad vitam corpusque tuendum habere natura ante debuit quam civitas ulla coisset. —Quod vero terram Deus universo generi hominum utendam, fruendam dederit, id quidem non potest ullo pacto privatis possessionibus obesse. Deus enim generi hominum donavisse terram in communem dicitur, non quod eius promiscuum apud omnes dominatum voluerit, sed quia partem nullam cuique assignavit possidendam, industriæ hominum institutisque populorum permissa privatarum possessionum descriptione. —Ceterum utcumque inter privatos distributa, inservire communi omnium utilitati terra non cessat, quoniam nemo est mortalium, quin alatur eo, quod agri efferunt. Qui re carent, suppleant opera: ita ut vere affirmari possit, universam comparandi victus cultusque rationem in labore consistere, quem quis vel in fundo insumat suo, vel in arte aliqua operosa, cuius merces tandem non aliunde, quam a multiplici terræ fetu ducitur, cum eoque permutatur.

Qua ex re rursus efficitur, privatas possessiones plane esse secundum naturam. Res enim eas, quæ ad conservandam vitam maximeque ad perficiendam requiruntur, terra quidem cum magna largitate fundit, sed fundere ex se sine hominum cultu et curatione non posset. Iamvero cum in parandis naturæ bonis industriam mentis viresque corporis homo

insumat, hoc ipso applicat ad sese eam naturæ corporeæ partem, quam ipse percoluit, in qua velut formam quamdam personæ suæ impressam reliquit; ut omnino rectum esse oporteat, eam partem ab eo possideri uti suam, nec ullo modo ius ipsius violare cuiquam licere.

Horum tam perspicua vis est argumentorum, ut mirabile videatur, dissentire quosdam exoletarum opinionum restitutores : qui usum quidem soli, variosque prædiorum fructus homini privato concedunt : at possideri ab eo ut domino vel solum, in quo ædificavit, vel prædium quod excoluit, plane ius esse negant. Quod cum negant, fraudatum iri partis suo labore rebus hominem, non vident. Ager quippe cultoris manu atque arte subactus habitum longe mutat : e silvestri frugifer ex infecundo ferax efficitur. Quibus autem rebus est melior factus, illæ sic solo inhærent miscenturque penitus, ut maximam partem nullo pacto sint separabiles a solo. Atqui id quemquam potiri illoque perfrui, in quo alius desudavit, utrumne iustitia patiatur ? Quo modo effectæ res caussam sequuntur a qua effectæ sunt, sic operæ fructum ad eos ipsos qui operam dederint, rectum est pertinere. Merito igitur universitas generis humani, dissentientibus paucorum opinionibus nihil admodum mota, studioseque naturam intuens, in ipsius lege naturæ fundamentum reperit partitionis bonorum, possessionesque privatas, ut quæ cum hominum natura pacatoque et tranquillo convictu maxime congruant, omnium saeculorum usu consecravit.—Leges autem civiles, quæ, cum iustæ sunt, virtutem suam ab ipsa naturali lege ducunt, id ius, de quo loquimur, confirmant ac vi etiam adhibenda tuentur.—Idem divinarum legum sanxit auctoritas, quæ vel appetere alienum gravissime vetant. *Non concupisces uxorem proximi tui : non domum, non agrum, non ancillam, non bovem, non asinum, et universa quæ illius sunt.*

Iura vero istiusmodi, quæ in hominibus insunt singulis, multo validiora intelliguntur esse si cum officiis hominum in convictu domestico apta et connexa spectentur.—In deligendo genere vitæ non est dubium, quin in potestate sit arbitrioque singulorum alterutrum malle, aut Jesu Christi sectari de virginitate consilium, aut maritali se vincolo obligare. Ius coniugii naturale ac primigenum homini adimere, caussamve nuptiarum præcipuam, Dei auctoritate initio constitutam, quoquo modo circumscribere lex hominum nulla potest. *Crescite et multiplicamini.* En igitur familia, seu societas domestica, perparva illa quidem, sed vera

¹ Deut. v. 21.

² Gen. i. 28.

societas, eademque omni civitate antiquior ; cui propterea sua quædam iura officiaque esse necesse est, quæ minime pendeant a republica. Quod igitur demonstravimus, ius dominii personis singularibus natura tributum, id transferri in hominem, qua caput est familiæ, oportet : immo tanto ius est illud validius, quanto persona humana in convictu domestico plura complectitur. Sanctissima naturæ lex est, ut victu omnique cultu paterfamilias tueatur, quos ipse procrearit : idemque illuc a natura ipsa deducitur, ut velit liberis suis, quippe qui paternam referunt et quodam modo producunt personam, anquirere et parare, unde se honeste possint in ancipiti vitæ cursu a misera fortuna defendere. Id vero efficere non alia ratione potest, nisi fructuosarum possessione rerum, quas ad liberos hereditate transmittat.—Quemadmodum civitas, eodem modo familia, ut memoravimus, veri nominis societas est, quæ potestate propria, hoc est paterna, regitur. Quamobrem, servatis utique finibus quos proxima eius caussa præscripserit, in deligendis adhibendisque rebus incolumitati ac iustæ libertate suæ necessariis, familia quidem paria saltem cum societate civili iura obtinet. Paria saltem diximus, quia cum convictus domesticus et cogitatione sit et re prior, quam civilis coniunctio, priora quoque esse magisque naturalia iura eius officiaque consequitur. Quod si cives, si familiæ, convictus humani societatisque participes factæ, pro adiumento offensionem, pro tutela deminutionem iuris sui in republica reperirent, fastidienda citius, quam optanda societas esset.

Velle igitur ut pervadat civile imperium arbitrato suo usque ad intima domorum, magnus ac perniciosus est error.—Certe si qua forte familia in summa rerum difficultate consilii inopia versetur, ut inde se ipsa expedire nullo pacto possit, rectum est subveniri publice rebus extremis : sunt enim familiæ singulæ pars quædam civitatis. Ac pari modo sicubi intra domesticos parietes gravis extiterit perturbatio iurium mutuatorum, suum cuique ius potestas publica vindicato : neque enim hoc est ad se rapere iura civium, sed munire atque firmare iustâ debitaque tutela. Hic tamen consistant necesse est, qui præsent rebus publicis : hos excedere fines natura non patitur. Patria potestas est eiusmodi, ut nec extingui, neque absorberi a republica possit, quia idem et commune habet cum ipsa hominum vita principium. *Filii sunt aliquid patris*, et velut paternæ amplificatio quædam personæ : proprieque loqui si volumus, non ipsi per se, sed per communitatem domesticam, in qua generati sunt, civilem ineunt ac participant societatem. Atque hac

ipsa de caussa, quod filii sunt *naturaliter aliquid patris. . . . antequam usum liberi arbitrii habeant, continentur sub parentum cura*.¹ Quod igitur *Socialistæ*, posthabitâ providentiâ parentum, introducunt providentiam reipublicæ, faciunt *contra iustitiam naturalem*, ac domorum compaginem dissolvunt.

Ac præter iniustitiam, nimis etiam apparet qualis esset omnium ordinum commutatio perturbatioque, quam dura et odiosa servitus civium consecutura. Aditus ad invidentiam mutuum, ad obtrectationes et discordias patefieret; ademptis ingenio singulorum sollertiaeque stimulis, ipsi divitiarum fontes necessario exarescerent: eaque, quam fingunt cogitatione, æquabilitas, aliud revera non esset nisi omnium hominum æque misera atque ignobilis, nullo discrimine, conditio.—Ex quibus omnibus perspicitur, illud *Socialismi* placitum de possessionibus in commune redigendis omnino repudiari oportere, quia iis ipsis, quibus est opitulandum, nocet; naturalibus singulorum iuribus repugnat, officia reipublicæ tranquillitatemque communem perturbat. Maneat ergo, cum plebi sublevatio quæritur, hoc in primis haberi fundamenti instar oportere, privatas possessiones inviolate servandas. Quo posito, remedium, quod exquiritur, unde petendum sit, explicabimus.

Confidenter ad argumentum aggredimur ac plane iure Nostro, propterea quod caussa agitur ea, cuius exitus probabilis quidem nullus, nisi advocata religione Ecclesiaque, reperietur. Cum vero et religionis custodia, et earum rerum, quæ in Ecclesiæ potestate sunt, penes Nos potissimum dispensatio sit, neglexisse officium taciturnitate videremur.—Profecto aliorum quoque operam et contentionem tanta hæc caussa desiderat: principum reipublicæ intelligimus, dominorum ac locupletium, denique ipsorum, pro quibus contentio est, proletariorum: illud tamen sine dubitatione affirmamus, inania conata hominum futura, Ecclesia posthabita. Videlicet Ecclesia est, quæ promittit ex Evangelio doctrinas, quarum virtute aut plane componi certamen potest, aut certe fieri, detracta asperitate, mollius: eademque est, quæ non instruere mentem tantummodo, sed regere vitam et mores singulorum præceptis suis contendit: quæ statum ipsum proletariorum ad meliora promovet pluribus utilissime institutis: quæ vult atque expetit omnium ordinum consilia viresque in id consociari, ut opificium rationibus, quam commodissime potest, consulatur: ad eamque rem adhiberi leges ipsas auctoritatemque reipublicæ, utique ratione ac modo, putat oportere.

¹ S. Thom. II-II. Quæst. x. art. xii.

Illud itaque statuatur primo loco, ferendam esse conditionem humanam : ima summis paria fieri in civili societate non posse. Agitant id quidem *Socialistæ* : sed omnis est contra rerum naturam vana contentio. Sunt enim in hominibus maximæ plurimæque natura dissimilitudines : non omnium paria ingenia sunt, non sollertia, non valetudo, non vires : quarum rerum necessarium discrimen sua sponte sequitur fortuna dispar. Idque plane ad usum cum privatorum tum communitalis accomodate ; indiget enim varia ad res gerendas facultate diversisque muneribus vita communis ; ad quæ fungenda munera potissimum impelluntur homines differentiâ rei cuiusque familiaris.—Et ad corporis laborem quod attinet, in ipso *statu innocentie* non iners omnino erat homo futurus : at vero quod ad animi delectationem tunc libere optavisset voluntas, idem postea in expiationem culpæ subire non sine molestiæ sensu cœgit necessitas. *Maledicta terra in opere tuo : in laboribus comedes ex ea cunctis diebus vitæ tuæ.*¹—Similique modo finis acerbitatum reliquarum in terris nullus est futurus, quia mala peccati consecraria aspera ad tolerandum sunt, dura, difficilia : eaque homini usque ad ultimum vitæ comitari est necesse. Itaque pati et perpeti humanum est, et ut homines experiantur ac tentent omnia, istiusmodi incommoda evellere ab humano convictu penitus nulla vi, nulla arte poterunt. Siqui id se profiteantur posse, si miseræ plebi vitam polliceantur omni dolore molestiaque vacantem, et refertam quiete ac perpetuis voluptatibus, næ illi populo imponunt, fraudemque struunt, in mala aliquando erupturam maiora præsentibus. "Optimum factu res humanas, ut se habent, ita contueri, simulque opportunum incommodis levamentum, uti diximus, aliunde petere.

Est illud in caussa, de qua dicimus, capitale malum, opinione fingere alterum ordinem sua sponte infensum alteri, quasi locupletes et proletarios ad digladiandum inter se pertinaci duello natura comparaverit. Quod adeo a ratione abhorret et a veritate, ut contra verissimum sit, quo modo in corpore diversa inter se membra conveniunt, unde illud existit temperamentum habitudinis, quam symmetriam recte dixeris, eodem modo naturam in civitate præcepisse ut geminæ illæ classes congruant inter se concorditer, sibi que convenienter ad æquilibratam respondeant. Omnino altera alterius indiget : non res sine operâ, nec sine re potest opera consistere. Concordia gignit pulcritudinem rerum

¹ Gen. III., 17.

atque ordinem : contra ex perpetuitate certaminis oriatur necesse est cum agresti immanitate confusio. Nunc vero ad dirimendum certamen, ipsasque eius radices amputandas, mira vis est institutorum christianorum, eaque multiplex.—Ac primum tota disciplina religionis, cuius est interpret et custos Ecclesia, magnopere potest locupletes et proletarios componere invicem et coniungere, scilicet utroque ordine ad officia mutua revocando, in primisque ad ea quæ a iustitia ducuntur. Quibus ex officiis illa proletarium atque opificem attingunt ; quod libere et cum æquitate pactum operæ sit, id integre et fideliter reddere : non rei ullo modo nocere, non personam violare dominorum : in ipsis tuendis rationibus suis abstinere a vi, nec seditionem induere unquam : nec commisceri cum hominibus flagitiosis, immodicas spes et promissa ingentia artificiose iactantibus, quod fere habet poenitentiam inutilem et fortunarum ruinas consequentes.—Ista vero ad divites spectant ac dominos : non habendos mancipiorum loco opifices : vereri in eis æquum esse dignitatem personæ, utique nobilitatem ab eo, character christianus qui dicitur. Quæstuosas artes, si naturæ ratio, si christiana philosophia audiatur, non pudori homini esse, sed decori, quia vitæ sustentandæ præbent honestam potestatem. Illud vere turpe et inhumanum, abuti hominibus pro rebus ad quæstum, nec facere eos pluris, quam quantum nervis polleant viribusque. Similiter præcipitur, religionis et bonorum animi haberi rationem in proletariis oportere. Quare dominorum partes esse, efficere ut idoneo temporis spatio pietati vacet opifex : non hominem dare obvium lenociniis corruptelarum illecebrisque peccandi : neque ullo pacto a cura domestica parsimoniamque studio abducere. Item non plus imponere operis, quam vires ferre queant, nec id genus, quod cum ætate sexuque dissideat. In maximis autem officiis dominorum illud eminet, iusta unicuique præbere. Profecto ut mercedis statuatur ex æquitate modus, causæ sunt considerandæ plures : sed generatim locupletes atque heri meminerint, premere emolumenti sui causa indigentes ac miseros, alienaque ex inopia captare quæstum, non divina, non humana iurâ sinere. Fraudare vero quemquam mercede debita grande piaculum est, quod iras e cælo ultrices clamore devocat. *Ecce merces operariorum. . . quæ fraudata est a vobis, clamat : et clamor eorum in aures Domini Sabaoth introivit.*¹ Postremo religiose cavendum locupletibus ne proletariorum compendiis quicquam noceant nec vi, nec dolo, nec fenebribus artibus : idque eo vel magis quod non satis illi

¹ Iac. v. 4.

snut contra iniurias atque impotentiam muniti, eorumque res, quo exilior, hoc sanctior habenda.

His obtemperatio legibus nonne posset vim caussasque dissidii vel sola restringere?—Sed Ecclesia tamen, Iesu Christo magistro et duce, persequitur maiora : videlicet perfectius quiddam præcipiendo, illuc spectat, ut alterum ordinem vicinitate proxima amicitiaque alteri coniungat.—Intelligere atque æstimare mortalia ex veritate non possumus, nisi dispexerit animus vitam alteram eamque immortalem : qua quidem dempta, contiuvuo forma ac vera notio honesti interiret : immo tota hæc rerum universitas in arcanum abiret nulli hominum investigationi pervium. Igitur, quod natura ipsa admonente didicimus, idem dogma est christianum, quo ratio et constitutio tota religionis tamquam fundamento principe nititur, cum ex hac vita excesserimus, tum vere nos esse victuros. Neque enim Deus hominem ad hæc fragilia et caduca, sed ad cælestia atque æterna generavit, terramque nobis ut exulandi locum, non ut sedem habitandi dedit. Divitiis ceterisque rebus, quæ appellantur bona, affluas, careas, ad æternam beatitudinem nihil interest : quemadmodum utare, id vero maxime interest. Acerbitates varias, quibus vita mortalis fere contextitur, Iesus Christus *copiosa redemptione* sua nequaquam sustulit, sed in virtutum incitamenta, materiamque bene merendi traduxit : ita plane ut nemo mortalium queat præmia sempiterna capessere, nisi cruentis Iesu Christi vestigiis ingrediatur. *Si sustinebimus, et conregnabimus.*¹ Laboribus ille et cruciatibus sponte susceptis, cruciatuum et laborum mirifice vim delenivit: nec solum exemplo, sed gratia sua perpetuaeque mercedis spe proposita, perpersionem dolorum effecit faciliorem: *id enim, quod in præsentī est momentaneum et leve tribulationis nostræ, supra modum in sublimitate æternum gloriæ pondus operatur in cælis.*²

Itaque fortunati monentur, non vacuitatem doloris afferre, nec ad felicitatem ævi sempiterni quicquam prodesse divitias, sed potius obesse: ³ terrori locupletibus esse debere Iesu Christi insuetas minas: rationem de usu fortunarum Deo iudici severissime aliquando reddendam. De ipsis opibus utendis excellens ac maximi momenti doctrina est, quam si philosophia incohatam, at Ecclesia tradidit perfectam plane, eademque

¹ II ad Tim. II, 12.

² II Cor. iv, 17.

³ Matt. xix, 23-24.

⁴ Luc. vi, 24-25.

efficit ut non cognitione tantum, sed moribus teneatur. Cuius doctrinæ in eo est fundamentum positum, quod iusta possessio pecuniarum a iusto pecuniarum usu distinguitur. Bona privatim possidere, quod paulo ante vidimus, ius est homini naturale: eoque uti iure, maxime in societate vitæ, non fas modo est, sed plane necessarium. *Licetum est, quod homo propria possideat. Et est etiam necessarium ad humanam vitam.*¹ At vero si illud quæeratur, qualem esse usum bonorum necesse sit, Ecclesia quidem sine ulla dubitatione respondet: *quantum ad hoc, non debet homo habere res exteriores ut proprias, sed ut communes, ut scilicet de facili aliquis eas communicet in necessitate aliorum. Unde Apostolus dicit: divitibus huius sæculi præcipe.....facile tribuere, communicare.*² Nemo certe opitulari aliis de eo iubetur, quod ad usus pertineat cum suis tum suorum necessarios: immo nec tradere aliis quo ipse egeat ad id servandum quod personæ conveniat, quodque deceat: *nul- lus enim inconvenienter vivere debet.*³ Sed ubi necessitati satis et decoro datum, officium est de eo quod superat gratificari indigentibus. *Quod superest, date eleemosinam.*⁴ Non iustitiæ, excepto in rebus extremis, officia ista sunt, sed caritatis christianæ, quam profecto lege agendo petere ius non est. Sed legibus iudiciisque hominum lex antecedit iudiciumque Christi Dei, qui multis modis suadet consuetudinem largiendi; *beatius est magis dare, quam accipere:*⁵ et collatam negatamve iudicaturus. *Quamdiu fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis.*⁶ —Quarum rerum hæc summa est; quicumque maiorem copiam bonorum Dei munere accepit, sive corporis et externa sint, sive animi, ob hanc causam accepisse, ut ad perfectionem sui pariterque, velut minister providentiæ divinæ, ad utilitates adhibeat ceterorum. *Habens ergo talentum, curat omnino ne taceat: habens rerum affluentiam, vigilet ne a misericordiæ largitate torpescat: habens artem qua regitur, magnopere studeat ut usum atque utilitatem illius cum proximo partiat.*⁷

Bonis autem fortunæ qui careant, ii ab Ecclesia perdocentur, non probro haberi, Deo iudice, paupertatem, nec eo pudendum, quod victus

¹ II-II Quæst. lxxvi, a. ii

² II-II Quæst. lxxv, a. ii.

³ II-II Quæst. xxxii, a. vi.

⁴ Luc, xi, 41.

⁵ Actor. xx, 35.

⁶ Matt xxv, 40.

⁷ S. Greg. Magn. in Evang. Hom. ix, n. 7.

labore quæretur. Idque confirmavit re et facto Christus Dominus, qui pro salute hominum *egenus factus est, cum esset dives*:¹ cumque esset filius Dei ac Deus ipsemet, videri tamen ac putari fabri filius voluit: quin etiam magnam vitæ partem in opere fabrili consumere non recusavit. *Nonne hic est faber, filius Mariæ?*² Huius divinitatem exempli intuentibus, ea facilius intelliguntur: veram hominis dignitatem atque excellentiam in moribus esse, hoc est in virtute, positam: virtutem vero commune mortalibus patrimonium, imis et summis, divitibus et proletariis æque parabile: nec aliud quippiam quam virtutes et merita, in quocumque reperiantur, mercedem beatitudinis æternæ sequuturam. Immo vero in calamitosorum genus propensior Dei ipsius videtur voluntas: beatos enim Iesus Christus nuncupat pauperes:³ invitat peramanter ad se, solatii caussa, quicumque in labore sint ac luctu:⁴ infimos et iniuria vexatos complectitur caritate præcipua. Quærum cognitione rerum facile in fortunatis deprimitur tumens animus, in ærumnosis demissus extollitur: alteri ad facilitatem, alteri ad modestiam flectuntur. Sic cupitum superbæ intervallum efficitur brevius, nec difficulter impetrabitur ut ordinis utriusque, iunctis amice dextris, copulentur voluntates.

Quos tamen, si christianis præceptis paruerint, parum est amicitia, amor etiam fraternus inter se coniugabit. Sentient enim et intelligent, omnes plane homines a communi parente Deo procreatos: omnes ad eundem finem bonorum tendere, qui Deus est ipse, qui afficere beatitudine perfecta atque absoluta et homines et Angelos unus potest: singulos item pariter esse Iesu Christi beneficio redemptos et in dignitatem filiorum Dei vindicatos, ut plane necessitudine fraterna cum inter se tum etiam cum Christo Dominio, *primogenito in multis fratribus*, contineantur. Item naturæ bona, munera gratiæ divinæ pertinere communiter et promiscue ad genus hominum universum, nec quemquam, nisi indignum, bonorum cælestium fieri exheredem. *Si autem filii, et heredes: heredes quidem Dei coheredes autem Christi.*⁵

Talis est forma officiorum ac iurium, quam christiana philosophia profitetur. Nonne quieturum perbrevis tempore certamen omne videatur, ubi illa in civili convictu valeret?

¹ II Corinth. viii, 9.

² Marc. vi, 3.

³ Matt. v, 3: *Beati pauperes spiritu.*

⁴ Matt. vi, 28: *Venite ad me omnes, qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos.*

⁵ Rom. viii, 17.

Denique nec satis habet Ecclesia viam inveniendæ curationis ostendere, sed admovet sua manu medicinam. Nam tota in eo est ut ad disciplinam doctrinamque suam excolat homines atque instituat: cuius doctrinæ saluberrimos rivos, Episcoporum et Cleri opera, quam latissime potest, curat deducendos. Deinde pervadere in animos nititur flectereque voluntates, ut divinorum disciplina præceptorum regi se gubernarique patiantur. Atque in hac parte, quæ princeps est ac permagni momenti, quia summa utilitatum caussaque tota in ipsa consistit, Ecclesia quidem una potest maxime. Quibus enim instrumentis ad permovendos animos utitur, ea sibi hanc ipsam ob causam tradita a Iesu Christo sunt, virtutemque habent divinitus insitam. Istiusmodi instrumenta sola sunt, quæ cordis attingere penetrales sinus apte queant, hominemque adducere ut obedientem se præbeat officio, motus animi appetentis regat, Deum et proximos caritate diligat singulari ac summa, omniaque animose perrumpat, quæ virtutis impediunt cursum.—Satis est in hoc genere exempla veterum paulisper cogitatione repetere. Res et facta commemoramus, quæ dubitationem nullam habent: scilicet civilem hominum communitatem funditus esse institutis christianis renovatam: huiusce virtute renovationis ad meliora promotum genus humanum, immo revocatum ab interitu ad vitam, auctumque perfectione tanta, ut nec extiterit ulla antea, nec sit in omnes consequentes ætates futura maior. Denique Iesum Christum horum esse beneficiorum principium eundem et finem: ut ab eo profecta, sic ad eum omnia referenda. Nimirum accepta Evangelii luce, cum incarnationis Verbi hominumque redemptionis grande mysterium orbis terrarum didicisset, vita Iesu Christi Dei et hominis pervasit civitates, eiusque fide et præceptis et legibus totas imbuat. Quare si societati generis humani medendum est, revocatio vitæ institutorumque christianorum sola medebitur. De societatibus enim dilabentibus illud rectissime præcipitur, revocari ad origines suas, cum restitui volunt, oportere. Hæc enim omnium consociationum perfectio est, de eo laborare idque assequi, cuius gratia institutæ sunt: ita ut motus actusque sociales eadem caussa pariat, quæ peperit societatem. Quamobrem declinare ab instituto, corruptio est: ad institutum redire, sanatio. Verissimeque id quemadmodum de toto reipublicæ corpore, eodem modo de illo ordine civium dicimus, qui vitam sustentant opere, quæ est longe maxima multitudo.

Nec tamen putandum, in colendis animis totas esse Ecclesiæ curas

ita defixas, ut ea negligat quæ ad vitam pertinent mortalem ac terrenam. —De proletariis nominatim vult et contendit ut emergant e misserimo statu fortunamque meliorem adipiscantur. Atque in id confert hoc ipso operam non medicorem, quod vocat et instituit homines ad virtutem. Mores enim christiani, ubi servantur integri, partem aliquam prosperitatis sua sponte pariunt rebus externis, quia conciliant principium ac fontem omnium bonorum Deum: coercent geminas vitæ pestes, quæ nimium sæpe hominem efficiunt in ipsa opum abundantia miserum, rerum, appetentiam nimiam et voluptatum sitim: ¹ contenti denique cultu victuque frugi, vectigal parsimonia suppleant, procul a vitiis, quæ non modo exiguas pecunias, sed maximas etiam copias exhauriunt, et lauta patrimonia dissipant. Sed præterea, ut bene habeant proletarii, recta providet, instituendis fovendisque rebus, quas ad sublevandam eorum inopiam intelligat conducibiles. Quin in hoc etiam genere beneficiorum ita semper excelluit, ut ab ipsis inimicis prædicatione efferatur. Ea vis erat apud vetustissimos christianos caritatis mutuæ, ut persæpe sua se re privarent, opitulandi causa divitiores: quamobrem *neque. . . . quisquam egens erat inter illos.*² Diaconis, in id nominatim ordine instituto, datum ab Apostolis negotium, ut quotidianæ beneficentiæ exercerent munia: ac Paulus Apostolus, etsi sollicitudine districtus omnium Ecclesiarum, nihilominus dare se in laboriosa itinera non dubitavit, quo ad tenuiores christianos stipem præsens afferret. Cuius generis pecunias, a christianis in unoquoque conventu ultro collatas, *deposita pietatis* nuncupat Tertullianus, quod scilicet insumerentur *egenis alendis humanisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, inque domesticis senibus, item naufragis.*³ Hinc sensim illud extitit patrimonium, quod religiosa cura tamquam rem familiarem indigentium Ecclesia custodivit. Immo vero subsidia miseræ plebi, remissa rogandi verecundia, comparavit. Nam et locupletium et indigentium communis parens, excitata ubique ad excellentem magnitudinem caritate, collegia condidit sodalium religiosorum, aliaque utiliter permulta instituit, quibus opem ferentibus, genus miseriarum prope nullum esset, quod solatio careret. Hodie quidem multi, quod eodem modo fecere olim ethnici, ad arguendam transgrediuntur Ecclesiam huius etiam tam egregiæ caritatis: cuius in locum subrogare visum est constitutum legibus publicis beneficentiam. Sed quæ chris-

¹ *Radix omnium malorum est cupiditas.* I. Tim. VI. 10.

² Act. IV. 34

³ Apol. II, XXXIX.

tianam caritatem suppléant, totam se ad alienas porrigentem utilitates, artes humanæ nullæ reperientur. Ecclesiæ solius est illa virtus, quia nisi a sacratissimo Iesu Christi corde ducitur, nulla est uspiam: vagatur autem a Christo longius, quicumque ab Ecclesia discesserit.

At vero non potest esse dubium quin, ad id quod est propositum, ea quoque, quæ in hominum potestate sunt, adiumenta requirantur. Omnino omnes, ad quos caussa pertinet, eodem intendant idemque laborent pro rata parte necesse est. Quod habet quandam cum moderatrice mundi providentia similitudinem: fere enim videmus rerum exitus a quibus caussis pendent, ex earum omnium conspiratione procedere.

Iamvero quota pars remedii a republica expectanda sit, præstat exquirere.—Rempublicam hoc loco intelligimus non quali populus utitur unus vel alter, sed qualem et vult recta ratio naturæ congruens, et probant divinæ documenta sapientiæ quæ Nos ipsi nominatim in litteris Encyclicis de civitatem constitutione christiana explicavimus. Itaque per quos civitas regitur, primum conferre operam generatim atque universe debent tota ratione legum atque institutorum, scilicet efficiendo ut ex ipsa conformatione atque administratione reipublicæ ultro prosperitatis tam civitatis quam privatorum efflorescat. Id est enim civilis prudentiæ munus, propriumque eorum, qui præsumt, officium. Nunc vero illa maxime efficiunt prosperas civitates, morum probitas, recte atque ordine constitutæ familiæ, custodia religionis ac iustitiæ, onerum publicorum cum moderata irrogatio, tum æqua partitio, incrementa artium et mercaturæ, florens agrorum cultura, et si qua sunt alia generis eiusdem, quæ quo maiore studio provehuntur, eo melius sunt victuri cives et beatius.—Harum igitur virtute rerum in potestate rectorum civitatis est, ut ceteris prodesse ordinebus, sic et proletarium conditionem iuvare plurimum: idque iure suo optimo, neque ulla cum importunitatis suspitione: debet enim respublica ex lege muneris sui in commune consulere. Quo autem commodorum copia provenerit ex hac generali providentia maior, eo minus oportebit alias ad opificium salutem experiri vias.

(*Continuabitur.*)

BOOK REVIEW

IN AND ABOUT ST. FRANCIS. A souvenir. Published for the benefit of St. John's Institute for Deaf-mutes and dedicated to the friends and patrons of St. Francis. By Rev. M. M. Gerend, president of St. John's Institute, Milwaukee. 1891.

To many whom this "souvenir" is likely to reach its contents will no doubt be a revelation of silent and efficient activity which begun under the single-minded direction of a noble priest has been continued in his spirit by those whose work appears to have upon it every mark of the blessing of God. The Milwaukee Ecclesiastical Seminary, founded in 1853 by the late Rev. Dr. Salzmann and the learned archbishop Heiss, at the time a simple priest, under the sanction of bishop Henni, counts at present 270 students. More than 600 priests have gone forth from it, among them the present archbishop of the diocese. The names of not a few of its superiors and professors have appeared in the lists of those who have made solid contributions to the theological literature of this country at a time when such labors were all the more creditable because there were few men who would have devoted themselves to the task. We need only mention the books of Heiss and Wapelhorst which are known to every ecclesiastic.

But the wisdom of those who planned and directed the work going on at St. Francis is especially apparent in the fact that they managed to group around a single centre a number of institutions kindred in their aim of Christian education and which aid each other in the promotion of this common end. The success of a secular establishment of charity or education depends in most cases on the ability of the chief who controls its spirit. Religious communities have their rules and traditions which cannot easily be ignored or overthrown by the ambition or weakness of an individual who may accidentally obtain the control. In the case of seculars, whatever may be the advantages derived from the healthy freedom that challenges actual and constant improvement, there remains always the danger of individual influence breaking down barriers and wise regulations seen only for the time being as hindrances to individual liberty. This danger can be forestalled by subjecting a superior to some kind of censorship so as to prevent his position from becoming one of irresponsible authority, a thing which is commonly effected by the establishment of boards and faculties or by the super-

vision of the Episcopal functionaries. But even here it is easy that the individual exercise predominating influence and absorb the independent judgment of those around him. The safest guarantee that abuse or neglect be rendered harmless or impossible lies in the dependence and responsibility of the controlling authority toward other institutions which are not only open and constant witnesses of its activity but which are vitally interested in the maintenance of a proper spirit in the management of the establishment.

This idea has been carried out in the institutions of St. Francis. There is first of all the Ecclesiastical Seminary. Next we have the Normal school or seminary in which teachers are trained with a view to support the acts and ordinances of the Baltimore Councils with regard to the schools. These are also active in aiding the thorough reform of Church music. The advantage of this harmonious preparation of the two factors on which all the church-work depends must be evident at first sight. The priest knows where to find the teacher who will efficiently help him in his parochial labor and whom he need not himself instruct in this difficult task.

Besides these two seminaries there are other schools which serve as object lessons to the candidates for the priesthood and the Normal school. These charitable institutions not only help to teach the seminarist practical lessons as far as may be necessary or advisable under the guidance of the superiors, but they furnish also the best candidates for each special calling, these being under the care and observation of those who are capable of discerning and fostering vocations to the priesthood or to the office of secular teachers. For those who show no aptitude for the one or the other there are the commercial and industrial courses which offer to make them useful and at the same time thoroughly Catholic citizens.

A notable feature in the general work done is the Institute for deaf mutes. They are trained in the requirements of a common school education, in the domestic duties and in the various art industries. The artistic workshops have scored remarkable success and give the comfortable prospect that some day our ecclesiastical art will be purified from those uncatholic features which predominate in many cases because the artists who supply our market at present lack the proper religious feeling. We are told that the workshops of St. Francis Institute turned out 20,000 dollars worth of orders last year. As the present publica-

tion is for the benefit of the deaf mute house it deserves a large sale. The numerous and handsome illustrations make it a good medium of eliciting a well deserved charity.

LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA, of the Society of Jesus. Edited by Rev. J. F. X. O'Connor, S. J. Written by the Students of Rhetoric Class of '92, of St. Francis Xavier's College, New York City. Centenary Edition. 1891.

If this beautiful volume possessed no other merit than that of having been written by a number of young students under the direction of a wise teacher, it would deserve the highest commendation. It is difficult indeed not to say much of this feature of "the Life" which the writers with noble fitness dedicate to the youths and maidens of America "as a short remembrance (may it last unto their death hour!) of that dear friend of God, the pure, the beautiful, the holy St. Aloysius." All honor to the mind that conceived this tribute and to the willing hearts and hands that carried it out.

We will only add that respect for sanctity would considerably grow, if distinctly catholic books were gotten up generally in the neat and faultless fashion of this volume. Such good taste would no doubt also help the publishers to find better sales in the end.

THE HOLY MASS EXPLAINED. A short explanation of the meaning of the Ceremonies of the Mass. Useful to all who take part in the Sacred Mysteries. By Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S. J. Translated by the Rev. P. O'Hare.—Fr. Pustet, & Co. 1891.

Surely both "the clergy and the laity will hail with delight the publication of this little treasure of modern Catholic literature, intended as it is to increase love and reverence for the great central act and feature of Catholic worship, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, its ceremonies and symbols." Father Schouppe's works are known for their lucidity and simple unction and the translator has preserved the one and the other in making this charming and useful exposition of the Holy Mass accessible to English readers. The style of print, illustration and binding are exceptionally neat which make it a suitable and not expensive gift to those whose devotion we would fix and increase.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- CURSUS VITÆ SPIRITUALIS** Facili ac perspicua methodo perdu-
cens hominem ab initio conversionis usque ad apicem sanctitatis.
Auctore R. P. D. Carolo Josepho Morotio, Congregationis S. Bernardi
Ordinis Cisterciensis monacho, etc. Editio Nova a Sacerdote Congr.
SS. Redemptoris adornata.—Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnatii.
Sumpt. Chart. et typis Friderici Pustet, S. Sed. Apost. Typogr. 1891.
- DE INSIGNIBUS EPISCOPORUM COMMENTARIA.** Auctore
Petro Josepho Rinaldi-Bucci.—Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincin-
nati. Sumpt. Chart. et typis Friderici Pustet, S. Sed. Apost.
Typogr. 1891.
- THE SEAL OF CONFESSION.** Rev. J. McIntire, D. D.—Birming-
ham: Hall and English. 1890.
- ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER LEO XIII**
"ON THE CONDITION OF LABOR."—Benziger Bros., New York,
Cincinnati, Chicago. 1891.
- ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER LEO XIII**
"ON THE CONDITION OF LABOR."—John Murphy & Co. Bal-
timore. 1891.
- SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI Leonis divina Providentia Papæ**
XIII Litteræ Encyclicæ: De conditione opificum.
- RUNDSCHREIBEN ERLASSEN VON UNSEREN HEILIGSTEN**
VATER LEO XIII "UEBER DIE ARBEITERFRAGE." Latei-
nisch und deutsch.—Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche Verlagsbuch-
handlung, 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis, Mo.
- ABAEIARDS 1121 ZU SOISSONS VERURTHEILTER TRACTA-**
TUS DE UNITATE ET TRINITATE DIVINA. Aufgefunden
und erstmals herausgegeben von Dr. Remigius Stoelzle, Prof. zu
Wurzburg.—Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder 1891. B. Herder, St.
Louis, Mo.
- DIE SCHRIFTINSPIRATION.** Eine Biblisch-Geschichtliche Studie
von P. Dausch. Gekroente Preisschrift. Freiburg im Breisgau. Her-
der. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.
- CONSIDERATIONES PRO REFORMATIONE VITÆ,** in usum
sacerdotum maxime tempore exercitiorum spiritualium. Conscriptit
G. Roder, S. J. Editio altera. Friburgi Brisg. 1891. B. Herder,
St. Louis, Mo.
- THE CHILD OF MARY.** A melodrama in three acts. By The Rt.
Rev. Mgr. J. De Concilio, D. D.—Jersey City, N. J. Published by the
Author. 1891.

